UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

Case No. 23-13359-VFP IN RE:

. M.L.K. Federal Building BED BATH & BEYOND INC.,

50 Walnut Street, 3rd Floor

Debtor. Newark, NJ 07102

April 24, 2023

2:16 p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF FIRST DAY MOTIONS

BEFORE HONORABLE VINCENT F. PAPALIA UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Debtors: Cole Schotz P.C.

> BY: MICHAEL D. SIROTA, ESQ. WARREN A. USATINE, ESQ.

FELICE R. YUDKIN, ESQ.

25 Main Street

Hackensack, New Jersey 07601

Kirkland & Ellis LLP

BY: JOSHUA A. SUSSBERG, ESQ.

EMILY E. GEIER, ESQ. DEREK I. HUNTER, ESQ. ROSS J. FIEDLER, ESQ.

CHARLES B. STERRETT, ESQ.

601 Lexington Avenue

New York, New York 10022

Audio Operator: Juan Filgueiras

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

> J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. 268 Evergreen Avenue Hamilton, New Jersey 08619 E-mail: jjcourt@jjcourt.com

(609) 586-2311 Fax No. (609) 587-3599

APPEARANCES (Continued):

For the U.S. Trustee:

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of the U.S. Trustee
BY: FRAN B. STEELE, ESQ.
ALEXANDRIA NIKOLINOS, ESQ.
MARTHA HILDEBRANDT, ESQ.
One Newark Center, Suite 2100
Newark, New Jersey 07102

For the Pre-Petition ABL ABL Administrative Agent:

Greenberg Traurig, LLP BY: ALAN J. BRODY, ESQ. 500 Campus Drive, Suite 400 Florham Park, New Jersey 07932

Davis Polk
BY: MARSHALL HUEBNER, ESQ.
ADAM L. SHPEEN, ESQ.
450 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10017

For Sixth Street
Specialty Lending, Inc.:

Duane Morris LLP
BY: MORRIS S. BAUER, ESQ.
SOMMER ROSS, ESQ.
1 Riverfront Plaza
1037 Raymond Boulevard
Suite 1800
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Proskauer Rose
BY: DAVID M. HILLMAN, ESQ.
CHARLES A. DALE, ESQ.
MEGAN R. VOLIN, ESQ.
REUVEN C. KLEIN, ESQ.
11 Times Square
New York, New York 10036

For Hilco Merchant Resources, LLC and Gordon Brothers Retail Partners, LLC: Troutman Pepper Hamilton Sanders LLP

BY: JESSICA D. MIKHAILEVICH, ESQ. 875 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Troutman Pepper Hamilton Sanders LLP

BY: STEPHEN M. FOX, ESQ. 400 Berwyn Park

899 Cassatt Road Berwyn, Pennsylvania 19312

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES:

Holders:

For Unsecured Bond Glenn Agre Bergman and Fuentes BY: KURT A. MAYR, ESQ. 1185 Avenue of the Americas 22nd Floor New York, New York 10036

> National Association of Attorneys General BY: KAREN CORDRY, ESQ. 1850 M Street NW, 12th Floor Washington, DC 20036

- - - - -

I N D E X

EXHIBITS

Number	<u>Description</u>	Evid
10	Ms. Etlin's declaration	30
36	Mr. Kurtz's declaration	32
37	Ms. Etlin's second declara	tion 31

THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon. It is Monday, 2 April 24, 2023. This is the United States Bankruptcy Court for 3 the District of New Jersey and we are here on 16 first day 4 matters in the case of Bed Bath & Beyond Inc., 23-13359, and 5 the many affiliated debtors that also filed.

1

6

7

9

13

14

17

18

20

22

23

24

25

Well, welcome to all that are here and I will ask for appearances, but it looks like there's a lot of appearances 8 here. So why don't we get started with the debtor.

MR. SIROTA: Your Honor, Michael Sirota. I'm here 10 with my partners, Warren Usatine, Felice Yudkin, Cole Schotz P.C., co-counsel to the debtors and it's great to see you in 12 person. It's been a long time.

THE COURT: Yep. Since the pandemic almost.

MR. SIROTA: Exactly. I'd like to introduce a great 15 friend, and more importantly, a great lawyer, Joshua Sussberg, from Kirkland & Ellis, and Mr. Sussberg will introduce his colleagues. And after appearances are entered, Mr. Sussberg will, with the Court's permission, provide an overview, if 19 that's acceptable.

THE COURT: Okay. That sounds like a fine way to 21 proceed.

MR. SIROTA: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Sussberg?

MR. SIROTA: Just your appearance.

MR. SUSSBERG: Thank you, Your Honor. Joshua

1 Sussberg from Kirkland & Ellis on behalf of Bed Bath & Beyond. 2 I wasn't sure if you were taking appearances of everyone in the courtroom or you just wanted to get into it.

THE COURT: Well, I guess, Mr. Sirota was saying that 5 he was going to -- you were going to make your appearance and introduce your colleagues and then we were going --

MR. SUSSBERG: You'll take --

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

17

18

19

22

THE COURT: -- take the other --

MR. SUSSBERG: -- other appearances.

THE COURT: -- appearances and --

MR. SUSSBERG: Happy to do so. I am joined by my 12 partners, Emily Geier and Derek Hunter and Ross Fiedler and 13 Charles Sterrett. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon and welcome.

MS. STEELE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Steele, Alex Nikolinos, and Martha Hildebrandt on behalf of the United States Trustee.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. BRODY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Alan Brody, Greenberg Traurig, on behalf of JPMorgan Chase, the prepetition ABL administrative agent.

And, Your Honor, I'd also like to introduce, from 23 David Polk, Marshall Huebner and Adam Shpeen, whose admissions pro hac have been filed and, of course, Your Honor, we ask that 25 \parallel they be allowed to appear today.

THE COURT: Okay. That's, of course, I'll 2 perfunctorily if anyone has any objection, but I'm going to allow their pro hac vice appearance today. Certainly given the circumstances, it's appropriate.

MR. BRODY: Thank you, Your Honor.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Your Honor. It's an honor to be in front of you.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

1

5

6

7

8

9

11

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. BAUER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Mo Bauer and 10∥ Sommer Ross, with Duane Morris, on behalf of Sixth Street Specialty Lending, the FILO agent. And I have with me David Hillman, Chad Dale, Megan Volin, and Reuven Klein of the Proskauer Rose firm, and we filed motions for their pro hac vice admissions with Your Honor, which are obviously pending, 15 \parallel and we would like them to be able to speak today also.

THE COURT: Well, good afternoon and the same applies to you.

> UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Your Honor.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. BAUER: Thank you, Your Honor.

There are no other appearances? THE COURT:

MS. MIKHAILEVICH: And, Your Honor, Jessica

Mikhailevich, from Troutman Pepper LLP, on behalf of Hilco

Merchant Resources, LLC and Gordon Brothers Retail Partners,

LLC. I'm also going to apply for admissions pro hac vice, also

in the file for docket, for Stephen Fox from Riemer Braunstein.

THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon.

1

2

3

4

7

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

MR. FOX: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And your appearance reminds me of one $5 \parallel$ little procedural matter is that if you could, if you're going to appear or participate in any of the hearings, to just come up to the podium so that we can hear you and you can actually, more importantly, be recorded -- or as importantly be recorded. Thank you.

There were a number of people, as I understand it, 11 that requested appearances on listen only, which is, you know, a relic of ours, Court Solutions also appearances. But if no one else is appearing, then I think we are on to Mr. Sussberg.

> MR. MAYR: Your Honor? Your Honor, can you hear me? THE COURT: Oh, yes. I'm sorry.

MR. MAYR: Yeah, sorry. This is -- I can't make it to the podium obviously, but this is Kurt Mayr from Glenn Agre Bergman & Fuentes. We're appearing today for a group of unsecured bond holders, a number of investment funds and institutional holders of the unsecured bonds of the debtor.

> THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MS. CORDRY: And Your Honor?

THE COURT: You did not come through for some reason just before. Okay.

Any other appearances --

MS. CORDRY: This is --

THE COURT: -- from -- via Zoom?

MS. CORDRY: Your Honor, this is Karen Cordry. 4 you hear me?

> THE COURT: Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

24

MS. CORDRY: Yes. Hi. I'm with the National Association of Attorneys General, the bankruptcy counsel there. I am not trying to file a pro hac appearance yet. Had a few comments on the going-out-of-business sale motion that I want to be able to make as appropriate when the time came. It would be representing states if we have an issue going forward. Hopefully, they will be relatively minor comments and we can 13 wrap them up. Thank you.

> THE COURT: Thank you.

Okay. Seems to be it, Mr. Sussberg.

MR. SUSSBERG: Thank you, Your Honor. Again, for the record, Joshua Sussberg, from Kirkland & Ellis, on behalf of Bed Bath & Beyond.

First and foremost, I wanted to thank you and your staff for hearing us on such short notice. It's very important some of the relief we're seeking, all of the relief, but most importantly we have a payroll due on Thursday --

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. SUSSBERG: -- and we have 14,000 employees that 25 \parallel are counting on that payroll. And in order to be in a position 1 to have Mr. Huebner's clients do whatever it is they do at $2 \parallel \text{JPMorgan}$ to turn the accounts back on, it was important to be 3 in court quickly. So thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You're quite welcome and we really 5 certainly recognize the urgency of the situation from the 6 papers that were filed.

> MR. SUSSBERG: Thank you. Thank you.

As I look around the room, a lot of friends and colleagues and people that I have met throughout the course of this matter, there's a ton of collective retail experience in many shapes and sizes. But when it comes to Bed Bath & Beyond, 12 at least for me, there are a lot of firsts.

There was my first day at college where I went with my mother to Bed Bath & Beyond on Erie Boulevard in Syracuse, 15 New York.

> THE COURT: Ah.

4

7

8

11

13

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SUSSBERG: There was my first day of law school 18 in New York City where I went, again, with my mother to Bed Bath & Beyond to get whatever I needed for my new apartment. There was the first --

THE COURT: Well, I'm a little older than you so I went with my daughter.

MR. SUSSBERG: There you go.

(Laughter.)

MR. SUSSBERG: Well, then I -- and then I moved in

1 with my then girlfriend, now wife, and we had an apartment and 2 went to Bed Bath & Beyond on East 61st Street in New York to get that apartment ready. And then we had our first son and I $4 \parallel$ made 100 trips to Bed Bath & Beyond on the west side because I 5 never got the right formula or the right diapers.

6

7

11

12

13

17

18

And that's the first time I visit my now in-laws and I saw the Bed Bath & Beyond coupon stacked from floor to ceiling and I might have taken a few. And then, of course, when we moved out to Westchester, New York, I remember visiting on the very first day we were there the Bed Bath & Beyond on Central Avenue.

It's also the first time that I have advised a company that received an acceleration notice from its lenders and the entire secured cash stack. And on the heals of that notice, it's the first time I have ever represented a company in distress that was able to access the equity markets not once, but twice.

And I also hope, Your Honor, that this is the first 19 time that we have started a wind-down and halted it because we figured out a going-concern solution. And we will spend some time today talking, Your Honor, about what we're going to do and what we have continued to do to figure out a way to save some or all of Bed Bath & Beyond and buybuy BABY. everybody on the company's side is going to do everything in 25 \parallel its power to do just that.

I do have a presentation that I wanted to run through $2 \parallel$ to give Your Honor some background, but I want to make a few introductions first in the courtroom.

THE COURT: Okav.

1

4

5

12

17

19

20

22

MR. SUSSBERG: Today, we have Ms. Sue Gove, who is 6 our chief executive officer, and we'll talk about the company 7 under Ms. Gove's leadership. We have David Kastin, the 8 company's general counsel; Susie Kim, she is our Senior Vice President Investor Relations and Treasury; and we have Julie 10 Strider. Where's Julie? She is the vice president of 11 Communications.

You have also seen, Your Honor, that we submitted 13 three declarations or maybe four declarations. Ms. Geier will 14 clean that up for me. The first was Ms. Holly Etlin's 15 declaration. She is the recently appointed chief restructuring 16 officer and interim CFO from AlixPartners. And we have Mr. David Kurtz from Lazard, the company's proposed investment 18 | banker, and we'll get into those declarations as we proceed.

> THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SUSSBERG: So if we could please share the 21 presentation? No clicker.

Briefly, Your Honor, and I think you have heard from 23 folks, but the debtors' professionals, Kirkland Cole Schotz, 24 Lazard, AlixPartners were being advised by A&G Realty Partners, 25 C Street Advisory Group on communications and Kroll is our

1 proposed claims and noticing agent.

2

7

11

17

18

22

24

So if we go to the next slide, you have heard from 3 folks, the ABL facility, Davis Polk & Greenberg, as well as FTI 4 Consulting, and then the FILO is Proskauer, Duane Morris, M3, 5 Houlihan Lokey. I'm sure we'll hear from Mr. Hillman and 6 Mr. Huebner throughout the course of the day.

As far as a business overview and a little bit of 8 history here, Your Honor, this is a 52-year-old company that, I don't say this lightly, is an iconic brand and it all started 10 pretty humble beginnings.

1971, Warren Eisenberg and Leonard Feinstein, here in 12 New Jersey, opened the first what was then called Bed 'n Bath and they started this company with \$100,000 and it was humble beginnings. The stores were 2,500 square feet. But they had left another retail company because they saw an opportunity where department stores were lagging and speciality retail really had a chance to become something.

By 1985, they had 11 Bed 'n Bath stores and they had 19 moved out to the West Coast. By 1987, as the company as was expanding and changing, they were spending money on merchandise not to make the stores pretty, but they decided to change their name because of the treasure trove experience at the stores, hence the beginnings of Bed Bath & Beyond.

And it's important to note that in the 1980s, and I 25 think this will be thematic throughout what we talk about, in 1 the face of significant competition, Linens 'N Things and many $2 \parallel$ other stores that came into the space, these people and this company adapted. And they opened its first superstore in $4 \parallel$ Springfield, New Jersey, and that was 20,000 square feet. And 5 the superstore experience and the merchandise that was available really gave the company an edge and that adaptation was important because it led to wild success.

7

8

11

17

22

23

24

And as you'll see, in 1992 the company was first listed on NASDAQ, BBBY. In 1999, sales exceeded one billion dollars for the first time and I think it's important the company decided that rather than using newspaper circular 12 advertising, we're going to use these coupons, and it became a 13 rage and a craze. And I'm pretty sure my mother-in-law still has -- I'm not going to say dozens, thousands of coupons and she did call for advice as to how to utilize those coupons, but we'll get there another moment.

In 2003 the company had grown, as you can see on the 18 map, to 575 stores in 44 different states and also in Puerto Rico and the growth continued in 2007 with stores that were opened in Canada. And we'll talk a bit today about what happened in Canada and what's going on in Canada, but those stores have been closed.

2008 was an announcement of a joint venture in Mexico. 2018, sales exceeded 12 billion dollars and there were 880 stores operating across North America and the company had

1 grown every single year. And we will talk about what happened $2 \parallel$ in 2019, which was the first year that the company experienced significant losses and led to everything that has happened to date.

Clicker may be lagging a bit behind. Apologies, Your Honor.

> THE COURT: That's okay.

MR. SUSSBERG: There we go.

THE COURT: Oh.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

21

MR. SUSSBERG: The two main brands, I think everyone's aware, Bed Bath & Beyond, linens, house appliances, air purifiers, anything you can imagine formed in a racetracktype setting as the founders had envisioned, so that if you went in to get a mattress linen, you were not leaving with just a mattress linen; you were leaving with lots of other things and I remember that well at college and law school.

And then buybuy BABY, prenatal, post-natal, strollers, whatever it could be, and the registry there is one I was familiar with when we were having children and, again, 20 many, many, many trips to buybuy BABY on 7th Avenue.

The company currently operates 360 Bed Bath & Beyond 22∥ stores and 120 buybuy BABY stores and that was part of the transformation plan that Ms. Gove put in place when she took over during the summer of 2022. And it's really the 25 \parallel transformation plan that we had sought to implement, and we'll 1 talk about briefly, with some of the equity capital that we 2 were fortunate enough to raise.

On the organizational chart, Your Honor, you 4 recognize we have 74 debtor entities. I just wanted to quickly 5 note the non-debtor entities so Your Honor is aware. 6 first two boxes at the top are the Canadian entities. Those are part of a Canadian proceeding. We are close to being complete with winding down all Canadian operations, but we will be presenting a motion for a coordination amongst the courts, $10 \parallel$ something that we have done in similar circumstances.

The bottom left are the Mexican joint ventures. 12 Those are not part of these proceedings.

And then finally, Oak Insurance Company, that's our captive insurer so we did not include that entity in the filing, nor could we.

THE COURT: Okay.

3

7

8

11

13

15

16

17

22

23

2.4

MR. SUSSBERG: From a governance perspective, Your 18∥ Honor, I did want to note that we have added three different independent directors to various of the companies' boards. As you'll see at the top, which we note is the sole note issuer of our three series of unsecured bonds that Mr. Mayr is representing, we added Carol Flaton as a director.

And then at all of our subsidiary entities, we added Pamela Corrie and John Foster as independent directors and they will be working together to investigate prepetition matters and 1 to deal with any conflict issues that arise in connection with $2 \parallel$ the filing, and Kirkland & Ellis and Cole Schotz will be 3 jointly advising them on their investigation, which commenced 4 prior to the filing of these bankruptcy cases.

5

6

8

9

11

17

18

The capital structure, Your Honor, is relatively straightforward. At the top, we have the ABL that's secured on the inventory in a first priority position, as well as cash and other items of the sort.

Behind them is the FILO facility. That's the 6th 10 Street facility. That was entered into in 2022 in the fall designed to provide the company with liquidity to implement 12 Ms. Gove's turnaround plan and buy inventory. And as we note, 13 that facility was increased over the course of the last couple of months in connection with the equity raised. And as I sit 15 here today, it's 547 million outstanding. We also have letters $16 \parallel$ of credit and finance leases. And then as I mentioned, the three series of unsecured bonds.

So why we are here, Your Honor, you know, I talked 19 about the company adapting back in the `80s and `90s and moving to the superstore experience and the enlarged space to deal with competition. And while the company has weathered the recession of 2008, as well as the challenging competitive environment in the '80s and '90s, the company did not adapt to the retail e-commerce boom and the founder was quoted in an article saying, "We missed the boat on the internet."

And the problem became such that competitors were $2 \parallel$ doing same day or day after pickup at the stores or delivery. And in order to implement that over a period of time takes $4 \parallel$ resources and dedication and the company, at the time back in $5 \parallel 2010$ during the internet boom, did not put the resources in.

And ultimately, I think this really is one of the reasons why it led to the ultimate demise of Bed Bath & Beyond. And if you look, in January 2014, right, the internet really started taking hold 2010 with the explosion of Amazon, but in January '14, Bed Bath & Beyond stock was trading at \$80 a share. When you look at 2018, it was down to \$14 a share and that represented a loss of \$15 billion in value and I think a lot of that is attributed to a failure to adapt, which is really, really important in a retail environment.

THE COURT: Has that been fixed?

MR. SUSSBERG: It has been fixed. The question became it was a little bit --

THE COURT: Too late.

MR. SUSSBERG: -- too late.

Point there.

1

6

7

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So in early 2019, Your Honor, the company reported its seventh consecutive quarter of declining same store sales and its first annual loss and sales decline in 30 years. Profits were down 48 percent year over year. Again, it's first unprofitable year.

And so, as a result of unprofitability and unrest, $2 \parallel$ there was an activist campaign, as you can see, and that led to the CEO of 16 years stepping down and an overhaul of the board of directors. And several of the board members that were 5 appointed in '19 remain on the board today.

1

6

7

11

17

22

23

And then in November of 2019, a new CEO was appointed and this was a former merchandising expert at Target. came in and had a different vision and he was going to move to private label and really kind of retool the business, which was successful at Target, at Bed Bath & Beyond with many different private labels. And unfortunately, as we'll talk about, it missed all expectations and the consumer was not interested. The consumer wanted the KitchenAid brands. The consumer wanted the brands that it had come to know and it did not have an ability to understand nor comprehend the expedited nature in which these private labels were introduced.

And so on the next slide, and we'll get into some of 18∥ this, but we just wanted to highlight that there really were both internal and external disruptions. The activist campaign reshaped the board and management and then the shift away from private label products, you know, really caused harm to the business.

We had a share buyback, that I will address, for a 24 billion dollars because people thought that the intrinsic value of the equity did not reflect reality and it ultimately ended

1 up causing the company to burn significant cash that otherwise 2 should have been used for operations.

We had another management change. Ms. Gove took over in the summer of 2022 and we note the shareholder action at the top on the right related to the meme stock craze, which we will also speak about.

And obviously COVID is part of the story, Your Honor, as you're well aware, and I know you presided over the Modell's case, which happened right when COVID happened and I had a similar experience with Pier 1.

THE COURT: Right.

3

5

6

7

8

11

12

17

18

MR. SUSSBERG: We were in court one week. 13 home the next. It was devastating from a retailer's perspective and it was the cause for a host of consternation across the industry. And then also, we have had supply chain 16 issues that caused deterioration in product and a host of problems that led us to where we are today.

Just briefly, Your Honor. You know the pitfalls of 19∥ private label, I think we hit it very well in Ms. Etlin's declaration. We tried to move too fast and too quick into a 21 whole new strategy that effectively lost sight of the consumer and the consumer's preference. And implementing nine different private label products as quickly as we were trying to do just didn't take hold and then, of course, the pandemic to pile on and it really caused a lot of disruption.

Now private label products carry higher margin but if 2 you implement it over time, maybe you reap the rewards, but we went too quickly and it proved to be a problem. $4 \parallel$ strained the supply chain as we note in the slide. It's longer lead times for private label products.

And as you're implementing that and then dealing with the pandemic, the supply chain was highly disrupted as a result not just because of the private label, but because of the macro environment. And as a result, as we note, we ran short on 200 of our best selling products costing the debtors an estimated \$100 million in sales.

THE COURT: I read somewhere there was unfulfilled orders that year, is that right?

MR. SUSSBERG: Unfulfilled orders.

THE COURT: Okay.

1

5

6

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

MR. SUSSBERG: Yes.

THE COURT: Of over --

MR. SUSSBERG: And close --

THE COURT: -- 100 --

MR. SUSSBERG: -- to \$200 million.

THE COURT: Over 200 million. 21

MR. SUSSBERG: Yes. COVID, I don't need to belabor, but COVID cost the company. Obviously shutdown all of its locations for a period of time. It was a difficult time for any retailer with workforce issues and furloughs, as well as

1 not understanding local mandates across the country where you $2 \parallel$ have stores that you want to be able to operate. Maybe you get an emergency relief to do so, but it caused major disruption at $4 \parallel$ a time where the company really could not afford that $5 \parallel disruption.$

I mentioned -- go back one -- the billion dollar share buyback. That occurred beginning in late 2020. at a time where the company had a billion five of cash and a billion two of debt and the company endeavored on a share buyback program, again, because they believed that the intrinsic value was priced too low and that it was going to 12 increase ultimate value for shareholders and for the company.

6

7

11

13

16

17

It proved to be a cash strain on the company at a time where no one anticipated that COVID was going to wreck havoc that it did and prove to be very disruptive from a business standpoint.

Then the meme stock madness. Ryan Cohen, well-known 18 meme stock investor, seized on the opportunity at Bed Bath, 19 similar to GameStop, as well as others. He purchased a ten percent stake in the company with a large call option. then March to August, he exited his position. And as soon as he exited, literally overnight with Securities filings, the stock tanked and caused it to crash pretty significantly. And on the heels of that, you see the shareholder action for 1.2 25 \blacksquare billion in securities fraud that was filed around that time.

So now Ms. Gove takes over during the summer of 2022 $2 \parallel$ and, you know, I say all the time, she had the job of turning around the Titanic. And when I tell you, I don't think I have ever met someone with more conviction, dedication and 5 perseverance than Ms. Gove, every single day she works because she cares about the people and she believes in the thesis and she's still doing it today, and that's why all of us are going to do everything we can to help her turn that Titanic around.

1

7

8

9

17

18

24

25

And she really went back to basics and she removed $10\parallel$ several of the private labels and went out and sought to repair vendor relationships. Now the problem after not using those vendors, the KitchenAids and the Calphalons, they go place their products elsewhere. And so bringing the vendors back into the mix, it takes time and it takes resources and it takes confidence in the business, all of which Ms. Gove was tasked with doing in a very short period of time.

But she also announced an intention to close significant underperforming stores and, frankly, that's how we got to the footprint we have today because it was her vision that a company could be restructured around the base that we have in place, the 360-or-so Bed Bath stores and the 120 buybuy BABY stores. And you also see, you know, very difficult reductions in force, as well as reductions in overhead, all of which was spearheaded at Ms. Gove's direction.

Some of the initiatives that she undertook to help

 $1 \parallel \text{right}$ the business, there was the raising of the 6th Street $2 \parallel FILO$. That was in the fall of 2022. There was a sale process. 3 Mr. Kurt speaks about this in length in the course of his $4 \parallel$ declaration. Lazard has left no stone unturned, reached 60 5 different parties, 30 of which signed NDAs, some of whom are still looking at the asset, many of whom have dropped out of 7 the process.

We had a first at the market offering. That was $9 \parallel 100 -- \$75$ million. Helped re-balance inventory and address 10 \parallel the balance sheet. Ms. Gove had a fall supplier engagement where she got everyone together to try to build confidence in 12 the business and then we did launch an exchange offer that, 13 unfortunately, failed in 2022.

8

11

14

17

18

22

Unfortunately, following the holiday season, the all 15 important holiday season in '22, there was no reprieve, and there has been no reprieve throughout the course of 2023. And in early 2023, we received a notice of acceleration, as well as the application of default interest and, frankly, all the 19 professionals in this room were tasked with preparing contingency plans and potentially being in front of Your Honor all the way back January.

And so how did we get to the end of April? We had 23 two different parties approach the company interested in investing. I know it's wild for a restructuring lawyer who's preparing for Chapter 11 to appreciate this concept, but two 1 different investors were interested in buying equity in the $2 \parallel$ company. And the reason that the Hudson Bay proposal was so attractive, Your Honor, is because based upon where share price $4 \parallel$ was, depending upon the time of the tranche of commitment from 5 Hudson Bay, the company had an opportunity to access up to a 6 billion dollars of capital.

And that billion dollars of capital, over the course of a year, so long as the stock price stayed above certain minimum thresholds, would have provided Ms. Gove and the team with the money and the resources to turn that business around and implement the various pillars that Ms. Gove sought to implement back in the summer of 2022, including getting all the 13 merchandise and the inventory suppliers back into the company.

7

8

11

14

17

18

22

24

And that's the reason why the board thought it made complete sense and, frankly, it's the reason why, I think, we were able to convince our lenders that back in February, we needed to pause. We needed to de-accelerate the loans. needed to amend and modify the credit agreements and we needed to take an opportunity to capitalize on this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to bring equity into this company and see if we could access the remaining billion dollars.

And the reality, Your Honor, as you have seen in the pleadings, while we were able to get over 300 million dollars from Hudson Bay, we ended up not keeping the share price at a certain point that we were able to access additional capital

and, as a result, the Hudson Bay deal was terminated.

1

2

7

10

11

17

18

24

25

Just to note, Your Honor, because this was part of 3 the calculus in convincing our lenders and ultimately the board 4 making a decision, Ms. Gove's vision really focused on three 5 buckets: customer centric focus; again, rightsizing the operations; closing additional underperforming stores and investing in inventory. And it was with these three pillars and potentially a billion dollars of capital from Hudson Bay that we really thought we had a chance to turn things around.

Now, on the heels of the Hudson Bay transaction terminating, we actually were able, yet again, to pull a rabbit out of a hat and get another ATM equity transaction with B Reilly Securities. And, again, kudos to Ms. Gove, Mr. Kastin, and the Lazard team for pulling this through. It allowed us to sell up to \$300 million of shares at a time through the market that we were able to capitalize on and we were able to secure additional equity proceeds.

And yet, again, our lenders modified, amended their 19 documents to allow this to happen so that we could get more time because this really was a function of getting more time because, at the end of the day, if we ran out of these opportunities we all knew what the Chapter 11 would ultimately look like, notwithstanding the sale process that we're running and so we did take advantage of that.

As far as where we are now, Your Honor, and the path

1 forward, you know, I think it's pretty clear in the pleadings $2 \parallel$ that obviously the company has significant overhead and cost and we need to minimize that burn as quickly as we can. $4 \parallel$ a result, we have affected and are in the process, and we'll be 5 seeking authority from Your Honor, to run a dual-track process. We are going to commence the wind-down of all of our open locations, but we are not, under any circumstances, giving up on a going concern for some or all of the remaining stores and there will be nothing that would make me happier than be able to stand up here in front of Your Honor in a month or two months' time and say, we found a buyer for 200, 300 or 400 of 12 the remaining stores. We're going to get all of our vendors together. We're going to start a new inventory program, all of which we will continue to explore because, frankly, I think the generations that come should have an opportunity to go to a Bed Bath & Beyond with their mother or their wife or for their kid, just like I was able to.

7

17

18

22

23

24

25

And no one on our side is going to stop working until 19 we have run out every single ground ball. And you can have our word for that and I want to assure everyone out there that would like to shop at a Bed Bath & Beyond again that we are committed to doing everything we possibly can to --

> Well, if you can --THE COURT:

MR. SUSSBERG: -- make that come to fruition.

If you can do that, there will be a lot

1 of happy people, including myself, and many other people here 2 because that's what we're ultimately here for and try to do the 3 best we can for the various stakeholders and I see where you're 4 headed.

MR. SUSSBERG: Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you, 6 Your Honor.

Just briefly, I'm going to cede the podium to $8 \parallel \text{Ms.}$ Geier to talk about our DIP financing. We did have a pretty healthy agenda. I'm hopeful many of these are non-10 \parallel controversial. We'll try to go through them quickly, but I do think it makes sense, if it's okay with Your Honor, to take up 12 the DIP financing first.

THE COURT: That's what I was -- I was going to ask you if that's the order. I was going to ask the parties what order they wanted to go in and if you think the DIP should go first, let's go first.

MR. SUSSBERG: Yeah. We'd like the DIP to go first 18 and then we'll follow the agenda in order.

> THE COURT: Okay.

MS. GEIER: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

Emily Geier from Kirkland & Ellis on MS. GEIER:

behalf of the debtors. 23

5

7

13

16

17

19

20

21

22

24

25

THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead. I have got --

MS. GEIER: Nice --

THE COURT: -- I have gotten some pleadings from you and some pretty long orders and --

MS. GEIER: Just a few. And --

THE COURT: -- and --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

12

14

15

17

19

22

23

24

25

MS. GEIER: -- it's just me putting them all together too, so I have been pretty tired.

Your Honor, there is, obviously, an army involved to get this number of papers prepared, but this is sort of the point of it all. How are we going to pay for it? How are we going to get through these cases and get to what should be a Chapter 11 plan.

So let's -- perhaps we can get the less interesting 13 parts out of the way regarding the declarations.

> THE COURT: Okay.

MS. GEIER: On this slide, I have just listed the 16 various docket numbers. As I'm sure Your Honor noticed, the DIP documents have trickled in throughout the day and so 18 there's a lot of docket numbers involved.

But the most important one before we get there is 20 actually Docket Number 10, which is Ms. Etlin's declaration in support of the filing of the cases and the various first day motions. I was wondering if Your Honor would view this as an appropriate time to go ahead and admit that into evidence?

> THE COURT: Okay. Well, so what --

MS. GEIER: Whatever your --

THE COURT: -- I -- the way --1 2 -- preference is. MS. GEIER: 3 THE COURT: -- I handle that is to say that -- and 4 now you're talking about Docket Number 10 of Miss --MS. GEIER: 5 That's correct, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Yeah. Ms. Etlin's declaration in support 7 of the first day motions. And I will -- the way I do that is I 8 ask if there's anyone who is participating who has any objection to the admission of that declaration as evidence and 10∥ whether they would seek to cross-examine on that or the direct 11 testimony. I ask about that as a matter of course and so I'll 12 do it again today. 13 MS. STEELE: The U.S. Trustee has no objection, Your Honor, and we hope that we won't have the need for cross-15 examination. THE COURT: Okay. Anyone else? 16 17 (No audible response.) THE COURT: All right. So Ms. Etlin's declaration at 18 19 Docket Number 10 is admitted into evidence. 20 (Docket #10 admitted into evidence.) 21 MS. GEIER: Fantastic. Thank you, Your Honor. And then also on Docket Number 36 is the declaration 22 of David Kurtz of Lazard, our investment banker, in support of the debt motion as well.

THE COURT: And I make the same statement as to

25

```
1 \parallel Docket Number 37, the second Etlin declaration in support of
 2
   the DIP motion.
 3
             MS. STEELE: No objection, Your Honor.
 4
             THE COURT: And having heard no other responses,
 5
  we'll admit that Docket Number 37 into evidence.
 6
                 (Docket #37 admitted into evidence.)
 7
             MS. GEIER:
                          Thank you, Your Honor. And then,
 8
   finally, Docket Number 37 is the declaration of Ms. Etlin again
   but in support of the debt motion. So --
10
             THE COURT:
                          Right.
11
             MS. GEIER:
                         Same person.
12
             THE COURT:
                          Yep.
13
             MS. GEIER: Different motion.
             MS. STEELE: No objection, Your Honor.
14
15
             THE COURT:
                          Okay.
16
                          So just to confirm, Your Honor.
             MS. GEIER:
17
   have Docket Numbers 36 and 37 admitted into evidence?
18
             THE COURT:
                         I thought --
19
             MS. GEIER:
                         I just want --
20
             THE COURT:
                         -- you said --
21
             MS. GEIER:
                         -- to make sure --
             THE COURT:
                          -- 37.
22
23
             MS. GEIER:
                          I apologize.
24
             THE COURT:
                          I thought you had them both.
25
             MS. GEIER: It very well could be --
```

```
THE COURT: Yeah. Yeah.
 1
 2
             MS. GEIER: -- probably almost certainly is my brain
 3
   saying --
 4
             THE COURT:
                        All right. Well --
 5
             MS. GEIER: -- the wrong numbers out loud.
 6
             THE COURT: -- you were talking also Mr. Kurtz's then
 7
   at 36?
 8
             MS. GEIER: That's correct, Your Honor.
 9
             THE COURT: All right. The same statement?
10
             MS. STEELE: Yes, Your Honor. No objection.
             THE COURT: All right. And having heard no other
11
12 objections, Number 36 will also be admitted.
13
                 (Docket #36 admitted into evidence.)
             MS. GEIER: Thank you, Your Honor. I think --
14
15
             THE COURT:
                         Thank you.
             MS. GEIER:
                        -- we are done now with the --
16
17
             THE COURT:
                        With the --
                        -- with at least the declarations.
18
             MS. GEIER:
19
             THE COURT:
                        Okay.
20
             MS. GEIER:
                         So --
21
             THE COURT:
                         They may not have been exciting, but
   there's a lot of stuff --
22
23
             MS. GEIER: -- they -- they're --
24
             THE COURT:
                        -- in from there.
25
             MS. GEIER: There is a lot of exciting stuff in there
```

1 to read. I will not read them directly to the group because 2 that's -- we have a lot to get through today.

3

7

11

15

16

17

18

20

23

24

Okay. So I just wanted to back up for one moment $4 \parallel$ before the petition date and sort of take us through a bit of 5 the time taking us from where we were, say in February through the petition date, and then what we propose for the DIP financing. I think it's helpful to see that the numbers as they changed and effectively the FILO came to sit where the ABL position was. The FILO sort of took on more and more of that 10 role.

Here, in February 2023, you see the FILO facility at $12 \mid 475$ million. That was after they injected 100 million of additional loans, sort of subbing out the position of the ABL to facilitate the equity transactions that Mr. Sussberg went over earlier.

So they were at 375 originally, then they were at And then as we got to -- and you can see obviously that sizable over advanced position that the debtors were in, as of 19 \parallel that date just prior to the infusion of the equity capital.

So when we reached the petition date -- well, you can see there's another ABL over advance. That was a new over advance because last week we found ourselves returning to the over advance position. There were critical obligation that the debtors needed to pay. These included payroll, freight, taxes, 25 not items that could be delayed.

And so the lenders joined together and both 2 approved -- and by "both" I mean the ABL lenders and the FILO -- approved this ABL over advance position, which, of course, had the effect of putting the FILO lenders an 5 additional 45 million -- I'm sorry -- 54 million behind.

But the company got these critical funds that at least enabled it to sort of land into Chapter 11, but we are not done because we still need the additional -- there we go. So this is --

> THE COURT: Oh.

1

6

7

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

20

MS. GEIER: -- the petition date and here we are 12 showing what we propose for the debtor-in-possession financing. So you can see the 54 million and 129 of the ABL facility listed above. And then now we have introduced the DIP facility. This is the funding that we need for these cases.

Then I'll explain later why we need it right now, but just wanted to show visually sort of where it would sit in the stack. This is 40 million of new money, along with 200 million 19 of prepetition FILO loans that sort of get rolled into the DIP.

On the next slide, there's key terms to highlight and you can see here again the 40 million of new money, referenced to this rescue loan. One of the most important things that we see when we look at this roll-up is that there's actually 96 million at stake -- or there's 94 million at stake because you 25 \parallel have the 54 million over advance that was on just prior to the

1 filing and then this additional 40 million.

2

7

8

11

13

17

24

So when you look at them together, you're really 3 talking more about a 2-to-1 roll-up and we previewed that in $4 \parallel$ our papers, but I think it's an important point to sort of 5 level set on what may otherwise be, like, a more in -- what 6 people might find a more interesting aspect of this DIP.

And the second point to make, I think, is that these are retail DIPs and particularly in a potential wind-down scenario as we are facing here if the going concern is not found, you often see full roll-up through the creeping ABL roll ups. You know, here we are in the slightly unusual position of 12 having this term loan of new money provided.

But what you see is very similar to what we have in other retail deals. You know, even my last retailer of -- in a similar situation was Pier 1 and they had effectively the same 16 ratio involved.

And then finally, although the roll-ups do need to 18 occur -- the roll-up does need to occur upon entry of this 19 \parallel interim order, we do have -- I think very little harm comes from it, simply because there are not really significant unencumbered assets and the assets that are there, you know, most of those are subject to final entry of the order. will still have the final order to really take up those issues.

A couple of other points on this slide is just to 25 highlight that there are very fair economic terms here.

1 Mr. Kurtz negotiating would point out that there is, you know, $2 \parallel$ a very reasonable origination fee and the rate on the DIP term loan is actually lower than the prepetition FILO. So the more 4 that is rolled up, you're actually paying a lower interest 5 rate. So --

THE COURT: But it's basically, what, five plus the 775, is that what it is or --

> MS. GEIER: Exactly.

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

17

19

20

21

THE COURT: -- five --

MS. GEIER: Yeah, in terms of the rate. So the prepetition FILO interest rate, so for the purpose of adequate protection is that is that the default rate of SOFA, plus 9.75 and here we have SOFA plus 7.75. So it's not insignificant that we are able to pay a lower interest rate on that amount.

So why do we need this \$40 million and what -- why do 16 we need it today?

THE COURT: And the 54 million came in last week 18 for -- in the last --

> MS. GEIER: That's correct --

THE COURT: -- several days?

-- Your Honor. Exactly. So the debtors MS. GEIER: 22 had important freight obligations to pay. You know, we have really been playing catch-up as much as possible trying to keep those -- we can't ship it out freight. We can't move our products from warehouses and distribution centers without those

1 freight costs, so those were critical.

2

7

8

9

11

13

15

17

18

20

22

There was payroll in there because although -- and 3 you'll hear from my partner, Mr. Hunter, about the various 4 aspects of the wages, but the weekly rates are paid at the 5 distribution center. So that was a payroll week for distribution centers and so that funding did need to go out and without that funding, we wouldn't have been able to file here because we couldn't be late.

But we still have a hole to fill and it's highlighted 10 right there. So this is the budget that was filed with the DIP credit agreement and it was actually filed, just to help with reference, the docket number -- it was filed at Docket Number 41. So in case you didn't see it when it was buried in all the 14 thousands of pages, we put it here.

So this is the hole that we need to fill this week. 16 So not in the future, this is right now. And through this first week, we pay payroll and benefits of 42 million and that includes the funding of a \$16 million WARN reserve and I can 19 talk about that in a moment.

It includes rent payment to our landlords. 21 includes May rent and it includes a portion of April stub rent as well. So we can talk about that a little bit more, if Your Honor would like. The freight is also in here. That continues 24 to be a major cost throughout this process you'll see. 25 that's provided for, as well.

All these things together produce -- although we do 2 take in receipts from these sales, it produces still a deficit of 30 million, so we do need the funding to occur so that we 4 can make sure we meet our obligations.

1

5

6

7

8

9

11

14

17

18

23

I want to highlight a couple of other very key and important aspects from the DIP from the debtors' perspective, key features that we have negotiated for that are contingent on sort of this process working as we have set out.

There are three reserves provided for in the DIP that $10\parallel$ are also our preserved path to a Chapter 11 plan. The first is a \$15 million priority claims reserve. So that insures that 12 the cost of doing business in Chapter 11 is you pay your 13 administrative and priority claims.

The debtors are aware of this and that's why this 15 reserve was created. We have negotiated this with the DIP lenders and they're committed to funding under certain conditions.

The second is the WARN reserve. As I mentioned, this 19∥ has been -- this is being funded this week. This is WARN dollars, so these are dollars that occur as a result of sending WARN notices and there are certain requirements for paying a set amount of wages in various states.

New Jersey, as Your Honor is probably aware, has a 24 new law in place that requires additional WARN payments to be 25 made. So we have a lot of what you might consider WARN

1 payments in the regular payroll line of the budget. But then 2 there's also the ones that get paid sort of more at the end, and that's what this reserve is for.

THE COURT: And that's the reserve is based on your 5 estimate of the liability or is it because I also read that you intended to keep many employees on, even though you sent them WARN Act notices?

MS. GEIER: That's correct, Your Honor. So although we send the WARN Act notices, and we are in the process of sending them today and the employees are aware of that, they have been part of those conversations, for those that do 12 receive the WARN notices, they are going out today.

Parties do work through that time. So we still need employees in place to do all the important work of making sure that these sales go through, facilitating the going-concern sale process that we are still very much pursuing, and ensuring that we can meet the various obligations of, you know, employees, landlords.

We sort of need the whole army behind us and also the store employees. Obviously, we need them to be able to sell --

> THE COURT: Well --

4

7

8

11

13

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

-- anything at the stores. MS. GEIER:

-- oh, I'm sure. I know you need the THE COURT: employees. I was just asking if that number is an estimate of your liability giving effect to that you're going to keep a lot 1 of the people on or that's, like, a high number that is being conservative and may --

MS. GEIER: It may --

2

3

4

5

6

11

14

15

17

18

20

21

2.4

25

THE COURT: -- be lower --

MS. GEIER: It may be conservative. There is actually, we would say, that the total number is, in some ways, $7 \parallel 33 \text{ million.}$ So 17 million of payroll going out that some folks 8 call working WARN. It's WARN notice dollars. You have been noticed. You continue to be paid through that period. 10 dollars are provided for in the payroll line item of the budget and so 17 million is already just agreed paid out for. 12 additional 16 million is for items, like, additional severance weeks that come on top pursuant to New Jersey law. Additional time.

There are -- there's a very complicated calculation 16 that we can provide to Your Honor. I'm probably not the right lawyer of the group to provide it, but this does represent what we believe to be the full liability and may -- may be even a 19 conservative estimate of that.

> THE COURT: Uh-huh. Okay.

MS. GEIER: And then additionally, there's the winddown reserve just to make sure that we can finalize the order to leave wind-down of the debtors if we do reach that circumstance.

THE COURT: So, Ms. Geier, I'm just going to ask you

a question. I'm going to stop you for a second and I'm --MS. GEIER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: -- I just want to ask a question as to $4 \parallel$ how this is all working in practical terms in the sense of you 5 have this, you know, as you called it, the \$30 million hole to fill in the first week, it appears, and then there's this \$15 million reserve, \$16 million reserve, \$5 million --

> MS. GEIER: Uh-huh.

1

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

17

18

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: -- reserve and there's a roll-up.

MS. GEIER: Uh-huh.

This might be a little bit of a -- I THE COURT: 12 don't know if you can answer it quickly or not but just for the benefit of myself and I think for everyone around, because there's a lot of words that are going around here and a lot of documents, but it just, in simple terms, to understand how these reserves are going to be funded --

> MS. GEIER: Um-hum.

THE COURT: -- when there's only, right, 15, plus 16, 19 plus 5 is 36. And so that did -- you know, there -- and I know that's -- those are different items. But I'm just saying --

> MS. GEIER: That's a great --

THE COURT: -- it's a lot of money.

Thank you, Your Honor. You're -- that's MS. GEIER: absolutely right, Your Honor. Let me clarify. These are not all funded day one. So the WARN reserve is funded day one.

1 The rest are funded through receipts coming in as we liquidate 2 the inventory.

So those are spread over time and they'll eventually 4 be fully reserved WARN dollars going in. So \$40 million draw, 5 single draw, today -- or rather tomorrow, assuming that we get approval today. We get the \$40 million in. The roll-up occurs right away, so it becomes a \$240 million DIP obligation with the debtors.

Then we, while we have the WARN reserve immediately 10 funded, these other two reserves are funded over time. 11 \parallel then upon the satisfaction of certain conditions in the order, 12 those are released and all DIP liens, other liens are released and so the -- those dollars just become the debtors' at the 14 point.

THE COURT: Is there a line for the funding of the 16 reserve in the forecast that you have there?

MS. GEIER: Yes, Your Honor. If you go to 18 supplemental items, way --

THE COURT: Yeah.

3

7

8

9

15

17

19

20

23

24

25

MS. GEIER: -- down at the bottom right above net cash flow is a line that says, "supplemental items," and it is approximately a million dollars a week. You can only see a little bit of it here, but the rest of it is funded, you know, throughout and over time.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. GEIER: Just briefly. There's also an adequate $2 \parallel \text{protection package available and provided for under the DIP}$ financing, because it's also, of course, our consensual use of 4 cash collateral. So we just wanted to show typical adequate 5 protection package and then this chart, which, you know, there will be a quiz on later but I certainly hope we don't want to go through in detail.

The DIP milestones are very similar to the ones that Mr. Sussberg already highlighted, but I'll just briefly share $10 \parallel$ what our process looks like from here. This is the time that 11 we have to finalize our plan to pursue our going-concern sale process and either find our buyer or commence an orderly winddown through a Chapter 11 plan. So we have 120 days effectively to do that and we think that's enough time to get it done.

> THE COURT: I hope so.

1

7

8

15

16

17

18

22

23

24

So with that, Your Honor, unless you have MS. GEIER: any questions about the details of the DIP, papers that we filed, I do want to highlight that we did file a revised order at Docket Number 69, I believe, just reflecting certain resolutions with landlord, counsel representing various landlords and also the Texas taxing authorities.

THE COURT: And so just when you went to that explanation with the supplemental items, which is the -- is one million dollars a week essentially.

```
MS. GEIER: Yes, Your Honor.
 1
 2
             THE COURT: And then right above that, it says,
 3
   "other RX flows," and I just don't know what an "RX flow" is.
 4
             MS. GEIER:
                         It's an excellent question, Your Honor.
 5
  I don't -- I know which line item you're talking about and I
 6
   don't know exactly what the substance of it is.
 7
             THE COURT: Because RX is a prescription or
 8
   something.
 9
              (Laughter.)
10
             MS. GEIER:
                        Well, fortunately those are not all the
   costs of my medication. I have --
11
12
             THE COURT:
                         Well, I don't think that --
13
             MS. GEIER: -- a pretty good health plan.
             THE COURT: I don't think that's what that is.
14
15
              (Laughter.)
             THE COURT: But I just -- I honest --
16
17
             THE COURT:
                         -- you know, I'm being very frank.
18 don't know what that means, so --
19
             MS. GEIER: I can get that answer in, like, one
20
   second --
21
             THE COURT:
                         Okay.
                        -- if you give -- okay.
22
             MS. GEIER:
23
             THE COURT:
                         Yeah.
                                Right there would be good.
24
             UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's definitely not
25 prescriptions.
```

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sure it is. 1 2 THE COURT: I'm sorry? 3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Same thing. 4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's definitely not 5 prescriptions. 6 THE COURT: No, no, I know. I figured you guys were 7 going to answer though. 8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's the other case. 9 MS. GEIER: Your Honor, the various other 10 | restructuring costs are reflected in that line item. 11 not professional fees. They're other costs of this case process. So I think any more detail than that and I think we will actually have to get our declarant up here to answer the 14 question. 15 THE COURT: Okay. All right. (Pause) 16 17 Thank you for that pause, Your Honor. MS. GEIER: 18 THE COURT: Okay. No problem. 19 MS. GEIER: The line items though includes U.S. 20 Trustee fees for that's expected restructuring outflow. addition, utility deposits so that's why there's that up-tick in week three. It reflects that deposit being placed. And 22 23 then also freight items also appear in that line item --24 THE COURT: That was a big number --25 MS. GEIER: -- as well.

```
THE COURT: -- the freight --
 1
 2
             MS. GEIER:
                        Yes.
 3
             THE COURT: -- the freight items was --
 4
             MS. GEIER:
                        Yes.
 5
             THE COURT: -- a big number, like --
 6
             MS. GEIER: Exactly.
 7
             THE COURT: -- 17 million or something like that.
   And so that -- in other words, that's going to be -- okay. So
   that's just going to be paid from the cash flow, in other
10 words?
             MS. GEIER: That's correct, Your Honor.
11
12
             THE COURT: Okay. All right.
13
             MS. GEIER:
                        So --
             THE COURT:
14
                        Those are my questions. Thank you,
15 Ms. Geier.
             MS. GEIER: You're welcome.
16
17
             THE COURT:
                         I hope I pronounced --
18
             MS. GEIER:
                        Thank you, Your Honor.
19
             THE COURT: -- your name correctly.
20
             MR. HILLMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
21
             THE COURT: Good afternoon.
22
             MR. HILLMAN: David Hillman, Proskauer Rose, on
23
   behalf of 6th Street Specialty Lending as the DIP agent and
24 FILO agent.
25
             May I be heard just to talk about the DIP and not
```

1 spend too much time on how we got here, but just to offer -- $2 \parallel$ you heard from Mr. Sussberg who walked through, in about 30 minutes, the company's perspective of how we landed here. I'd like to use three minutes --

> THE COURT: Okay.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

19

MR. HILLMAN: -- to just give you the perspective of the --

THE COURT: You could take four or five.

MR. HILLMAN: Okay.

THE COURT: It's okay.

MR. HILLMAN: I won't go over that.

So our perspective. You heard from Mr. Sussberg about the company having been around for 52 years. Street's relationship with the company is not even a year old. The initial loan that 6th Street and the FILO lenders made was, as you heard, \$375 million in August and it was to provide liquidity for the company's turnaround plan that you heard 18 Mr. Sussberg describe.

The company used those loan proceeds, in part, to pay overdue vendors and to get vendor support going forward. Going into, as Mr. Sussberg talked about, the critical holiday season, the company was significantly off its plan and, you know, the poor results during the holiday season started a rapid, downward spiral. So within a quarter, after making that 25 loan, the company's liquidity position was substantially off.

I think the numbers are more than 530 million off their plan.

1

2

11

17

19

During the next four months the company, while in the 3 some extreme distress, did try the maneuvers that Mr. Sussberg 4 outlined and they were unsuccessful. And during that entire 5 time, 6th Street and FILO lenders worked with the company to try to right the ship. This was a challenge. At all times we worked with the company to try to avoid the collapse of an iconic brand and we provided hundreds of millions of dollars to the company, which preserved jobs and it supported payments to landlords, vendors, shippers and suppliers.

This is interesting. In four months, 6th Street and 12 the FILO lenders agreed to amend or waive their loan agreements five times. And you heard Mr. Sussberg talk about that support of the lenders, including by way of paving the way to provide \$100 million in February, which allowed for the de-acceleration of the loan that you heard about. This created some additional liquidity to operate, but the company was hemorrhaging cash and 18 you heard about the two equity transactions.

Last week -- now I'm approaching into the DIP here -the company approached 6th Street about providing DIP financing for an orderly liquidation. At that point, the company's financial situation was so dire they needed money just to get into bankruptcy. You asked about when that loan was made. was a two-step process. The loan was funded one business day ago, Friday at 9:15 in the morning.

THE COURT: Oh.

1

2

3

8

15

17

18

20

23

24

MR. HILLMAN: Now, I think it's clear. We had I'll call it a pre-DIP rescue loan on Friday and here we are today, $4 \parallel 54 million on Friday morning and here we are Monday, 3:15 with 5 another \$40 million. So the FILO lenders would have much preferred to make a DIP today, not one on Friday and not one $7 \parallel$ today for 94, 95 million dollars. That wasn't an option.

The company needed the what I'm referring to as "the rescue loans" to make some critical payments and the rescue $10\,
Vert$ loan nominally was made by the ABL lenders. But because of the 11 over advance that you saw on the chart that was put up in 12 connection with the DIP, for all intents and purposes, it was funded by 6th Street and the FILO lenders because their 14 recovery is last out.

So that was our economic stake that funded Friday. 16 So when you think about this, we didn't want to make a loan on the eve of bankruptcy. We did it again to support the company and so the second step of the process is the more traditional 19 piece of this DIP, the \$40 million.

So, look, we wish that there was a different outcome and I'm going to walk through the DIP and I want to tackle the questions that you asked Ms. Geier, so that there's no ambiguity or confusion for Your Honor.

You asked about the funding of the reserves and you 25 got the numbers right. They're in the DIP order.

1 paragraph 10. And they are funded, the priority reserve is 2 funded roughly \$900,000 a week from the proceeds of the 3 liquidation of the inventory.

> THE COURT: Right.

4

5

6

8

12

17

18

19

22

MR. HILLMAN: And that's what the budget contemplates. There's a cadence to the funding of the reserve. $7 \parallel \text{All}$ the reserves are funded in accordance with the budget.

You heard about the WARN reserve. I believe the budget contemplates that that's funded next week and the other 10 \parallel reserve, the wind-down reserve, is filed later in the cadence 11 of the budget.

We talked about the roll up. And, again, I think 13 this is an important piece. We should look at the totality of the economic context. And when you look at the totality of the 15 economic context, it's for all intents and purposes a \$95 16 million DIP with a \$200 million roll-up. And, yes, that is contemplated to happen at the interim order.

So my job is to make sure that if there's any ambiguity in your mind about the DIP or any of its terms, that I'm here to answer them directly and concretely, so anything that you have to ask, I want to be responsive.

THE COURT: Well, I mean I think that the question 23 people have is, you know, how that 200 million impacts the rest of the stakeholders and how that changes things so that, you 25 \parallel know, obviously you or your client is not doing it

1 altruistically. It's a business and this is a tough situation $2 \parallel$ and I completely understand that, but I think that's where the 3 people might have questions.

4

7

11

13

17

18

20

22

23

24

25

MR. HILLMAN: Right. And so the roll-up was always 5 part of the economic consideration for doing the transactions for providing yet another round of additional capital. importantly, the roll-up is subject to the challenge period and that's specifically set forth in the order that's before Your Honor. So I think that's the sort of safety net to deal with this. It happens on the interim and it is an inextricable component to the willingness to provide this company with yet 12 another round of additional capital, right?

We stepped up in August to provide financing. stepped up in February to provide another 100 million. 15 amendments in four months. We have provided stabilizing capital in support for the company and to do it yet again, this is simply the terms of the proposal holistically before the Court and that the parties have been able to reach at the 19 negotiating table.

The other piece that I would mention, there's the interest that I think you asked about on the roll-up. It's not paid in cash. It PIKs. So that's another piece that provides additional liquidity to the company.

> Well --THE COURT:

MR. HILLMAN: Have I answered your questions?

THE COURT: -- that's --1 2 MR. HILLMAN: Okay. 3 THE COURT: -- that --4 MR. HILLMAN: I --5 THE COURT: The PIK is a payment in kind? 6 MR. HILLMAN: Yeah. Yes. 7 THE COURT: Yeah. 8 MR. HILLMAN: So I appreciate you allowing me the time to share our perspective and look forward to an 10 pportunity to be before Your Honor and to work with the other 11 stakeholders in the case. And any questions about this that 12 needs to be directed to me, I'm here and ready to answer those 13 questions. 14 THE COURT: Well, and here -- Mister -- I just want 15 \parallel to say. The FILO facility at -- is right, I guess, the 16 principal is 547 million. The ABL is 80 million ahead of it. 17 That's, like, 620 million. Between the two of them, as I 18 understand it, that is collateralized by maybe not every singe 19 asset of the debtor's, but substantially all the assets of the 20 debtor's? 21 MR. HILLMAN: There are some assets that are not currently encumbered, some property and some real estate. 23 THE COURT: That's not --24 MR. HILLMAN: And I believe it's also when you

25 identify the litany of claims, I think there are also 100

million of letters of credit outstanding, as well. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you. 3 MR. HILLMAN: Thank you. 4 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. That was helpful. 5 MR. HUEBNER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. For the 6 record --7 THE COURT: Good afternoon. MR. HUEBNER: -- Marshall Huebner of Davis Polk on 8 behalf of JPMorgan as ABL agent. 10 I will take about two minutes. So --11 THE COURT: Okay. MR. HUEBNER: -- I'm well shorter than Mr. Hillman. 12 13 First, let me begin by noting that Mr. Sussberg's 14 | lyrical and entirely appropriate opening was, in some ways, too 15 modest because he shared with this Court the aspiration that 16 people would be able to go with their wives and mothers to Bed 17 Bath for many decades to come, but yet he described himself, of 18 course, as a father --19 THE COURT: Uh-huh. 20 MR. HUEBNER: -- and a husband who's done that. 21 as someone took four girls to college and moved three of them into apartments and two of them through pregnancy, I could echo those stories of all the different Bed Baths in --23 2.4 THE COURT: As I can. 25 MR. HUEBNER: -- in one's life. So I guess I'm in1 between the generations here since --

2

3

4

5

7

8

17

19

THE COURT: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. HUEBNER: -- I have grandchildren --

THE COURT: I'll give you that.

MR. HUEBNER: -- as well. So just a couple of other 6 quick things, Your Honor.

Number one, in terms of the support of the lenders, and to be a little bit more precise about a couple of things, there were actually five amendments in the last three months as 10 \parallel the debtors worked through trying to raise money. The ABL over 11 advance that was done last Friday with the consent of the FILO 12 | lenders by the ABL lenders was \$54 million and closed late 13 morning. Your Honor, to be clear, as I think was ultimately corrected, but let's say it once and say it right, there's \$83 15 million -- I think it's 82.8 -- of outstanding loans and about 16 102 million at LCs. Those are the ABL obligations. It's those two things together. It's letters of credit, as well as the 18 borrowings.

Your Honor, Mr. Sussberg talked about a series of 20 firsts. I'm going to talk about a professional first certainly 21 for me and I have been doing this for a rather long time. 22 deceleration of the ABL facility is something that in more than 30 years of practice I have never even not only not seen, didn't even imagine was possible to get 100 percent syndicate 25 vote in a broadly syndicated ABL facility to put essentially

1 the debtor back in the ability to borrow.

2

7

11

13

17

18

24

25

The debtors use that ability intensely, as they were 3 supposed to and should have and did. Just so the Court is $4 \parallel$ aware, there were approximately 40 borrowings since the 5 February reinstatement essentially of the facility that totaled \$757.528 million. So in addition to having access to segments of the equity proceeds that were raised and the like, the reopening of the tap was another expression of support by the lenders to let the debtors explore. As you have heard today, they will continue to explore every possible available option to figure out how to do the best they can by the many 12 stakeholders of this storied and, indeed, iconic brand.

Your Honor, the only other thing I would mention and with that I'm done as I promised you -- I have very little to say this morning -- is that the DIP order, while it's called the DIP motion and the DIP order, as Ms. Geier pointed out near the end of her presentation, also contains the adequate protection package for the secured lenders. It's not, I think, 19 particularly analytically interesting. I don't imagine it's going to drawn much attention from anybody. We are an ABL lender and that is an extremely safe facility that has a first lien as the Court asked about and was answered. Not only a blanket lien on virtually all assets, but in particular in a retail case, a blanket lien on all current assets, right?

MR. HUEBNER: And so you're talking about inventory $2 \parallel$ and receivables and cash and securities and net equity and LCs. 3 And so ABLs are designed to be lost cost facilities because 4 they are very, very safe and they are very, very over secured 5 and so I don't imagine that we will be interesting to anybody in this case. But should we end up interesting, obviously we're here to explain not only what the ABL --

THE COURT: But --

1

6

7

8

9

11

12

17

19

22

23

24

MR. HUEBNER: -- lenders did but they're, I think, quite extraordinary support of extraordinary efforts by a company to figure out how to do the best that it can.

THE COURT: But between -- as I was saying before, -13 between the ABL and the FILO, there's, you know, whatever, seven-or-so hundred million that's out there. And that is -but one way or another, however this all shook out in the Chapter 11 reorganization or wherever we would be, that 700 million was secured by virtually everything except the real 18 estate and whatever else exceptions there are.

MR. HUEBNER: Yeah. And even the real estate, Your Honor, it was some of the real estate that was outside and just so the Court knows, today is certainly not the day for this conversation. I don't think any day will be the day for this conversation.

But so that the Court is aware, their presentation 25 referred to an over advance of \$193 million in February. I

1 actually believe the exact number was 198.33, but that's okay. 2 \parallel On that date, so the Court knows, there was approximately \$694 3 million outstanding. I believe that the collateral was very $4 \parallel$ comfortably double that, even at the lowest possible point. 5 When you add up all of the inventory, all of the receivables, 6 the debtors' own auction rate securities, they own extremely $7 \parallel$ valuable intellectual property, as you might imagine.

8

15

16

17

18

20

In many sort of, you know, precedent, iconic retailer cases, Polaroid, Kodak, and the like, you know, the IP alone 10∥ fetched very, very substantial value. And so Your Honor is 11 correct. The current loan balance, you know, when you add our, 12 whatever it is, 185 to the 575-ish of the FILO, you measure that against virtually the company's entire asset base, and even back in February, I don't think there's any possible question.

My memory is that the gross inventory alone was assessed at 1.072 billion on the date of the over advance when the borrowing base certificate was delivered and that's even 19 | leaving aside hundreds of millions of dollars.

Again, please don't hold me to this. I'm doing this from ancient, tired memory. I think the IP forced liquidation value is really, like, 168. I mean there's just another 100 here and another 40 there and auction rate securities that were actually monetized after the February over-advanced date for 25 tens of millions of dollars.

And so, yes, I think that, you know, we'd be $2 \parallel$ surprised if anyone did not share the view that there was over collateralization to a very substantial degree at all points as an ABL facility is designed to have.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir.

MR. HUEBNER: So unless there are further questions, Your Honor, have a good afternoon.

> THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Steele?

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

18

20

23

24

MS. STEELE: Thank you, Your Honor. Good afternoon. Fran Steele on behalf of the U.S. Trustee.

Your Honor, as you're aware, the interim order that was filed, and I'm showing Your Honor, is well over 100 pages. Holding it up for you. And as you can imagine, the attorneys involved had days, weeks, months to negotiate and look at this order and we were given the order on Saturday, which we appreciate receiving in advance, but the fact of the matter is, is that the order was put on the docket yesterday, which gives 19 most parties in interest one day to review this order.

And the order contains various extraordinary provisions including the roll-up. And the US Trustee worked with counsel regarding many of the extraordinary provisions and our changes were accepted and they're reflected in this order.

The remaining issue is the request for the roll-up 25 today one day after the case was filed. And we don't object to 1 the roll-up per se, Your Honor. We object to the timing. 2 submit that the roll-up should not be granted on this first day 3 but, instead, should be on a second day hearing after a 4 Committee has had a chance to review. And we respectfully 5 inform the Court that the challenge period doesn't adequately 6 give the Committee a chance to totally review the roll-up.

And on that basis, the U.S. Trustee objects to the 8 roll-up and we ask Your Honor not to grant the roll-up today, to push the roll-up provision to the second day hearing. And in the event Your Honor does grant the roll-up today, then we would ask that there be some provision in the order allowing 12 the Committee to actually review the roll-up provision and 13 unwind the provision should it be warranted.

THE COURT: Didn't we just hear from counsel that one 15 of the reasons that it's -- well, that it was critical, first of all, that it was a key component of the deal and without it, there would not have been a deal. But didn't we just hear from them -- from -- I'm sorry. I don't remember which man it was 19 that --

> MR. HILLMAN: Mr. Hillman.

7

11

14

17

18

20

21

23

24

25

THE COURT: Yes. So that it was -- the challenge to that is allowed and it's preserved.

MS. STEELE: And does that challenge provide for the unwinding of the roll-up should the Committee find that it's not proper --

THE COURT: Well --1 2 MS. STEELE: -- and not warranted or does it --3 THE COURT: -- but --4 MS. STEELE: -- just challenge the validity of the 5 liens? 6 THE COURT: Well, I mean, if you're challenging the 7 validity of the lien or you're challenging the roll-up or whatever you're challenging, there's a pretty significant person behind the counsel there and I mean, to me, that means if it's -- the purpose of challenging it is to get it back, I 11 quess. I don't know what else it is. 12 MS. STEELE: If that's --13 THE COURT: I don't know --14 MS. STEELE: -- what Your Honor is saying, that that 15 challenge encompasses that, then the U.S. Trustee would accept that representation and if that's in the order, then we would not object today. But we just wanted to make sure, as Your 17 18 Honor knows, the Committee review is extremely important and we 19 want the Committee to be able to review these provisions. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 MR. HILLMAN: May I approach, Your Honor? 22 THE COURT: Absolutely. 23 MR. HILLMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. For the record, David Hillman for the FILO agent and DIP agent. So paragraph 8

25 \parallel of the order says that upon entry of the interim order and

1 subject to paragraph 43, the roll-up occurs. Paragraph 43 is 2 the so-called challenge period.

So the issue is the challenge period is, I would say, 4 plain vanilla, garden variety things that a party with standing 5 can challenge and it is lien priority. It is validity. If there's something defective with the debt that's rolled up, there is a remedy.

But I think what we're hearing from the U.S. Trustee is something different. The U.S. Trustee wants to preserve the ability for someone to come back here at the final order and say, don't roll up valid debt or roll-up less valid debt. 12 is foreclosed. That decision -- and this is a point that I don't think I made before that I think is worth emphasizing. The \$40 million DIP is a single-draw term loan. It's out the door tomorrow. It's out the -- maybe even out the door today. Okav.

> THE COURT: Yes.

3

7

8

11

16

17

18

21

22

MR. HILLMAN: So if we're going to provide the 19 benefit of our bargain, then the panoply of rights that we're expecting can't be yanked back from us after we've provided that capital.

Now, the safety net is what the Court has seen in innumerable cases before you of a challenge period, but it is not the freedom to come back and simply undo the roll-up unless 25 they bring a challenge. The challenge is, among other things,

1 the validity and priority of a debt and there's a long list of 2 the things typical, right down the middle of the fairway, 3 challenge period.

4

7

10

11

13

15

17

18

21

23

The relief that the U.S. Trustee, with all due 5 respect, is asking for is far broader and effectively would require the Court to deny the roll-up. And I think I have been clear on this, and the debtors can supplement this point, there is no possibility of doing the \$40 million financing without the roll-up.

They are intrinsically linked and it's subject to the challenge period. And I think that is the protection that could give the Court comfort to know that if someone seeks to challenge the rolled-up debt for any one of the reasons in the paragraph 43, they have the ability to do so.

THE COURT: Well, and isn't that the way it always goes? I mean that's the way it is. It's if you challenge it, the challenge doesn't happen in one minute. It happen -there's an adversary proceeding or a motion or something filed and my quess is -- I don't know, maybe I'm going out on a limb -- I would say a challenge would be vigorously defended.

So I think the issue about taking it -- you know, taking it back or immediately or -- I don't know. It sounds like a disgorgement or forfeiture you're talking about. not my understanding of a challenge. So that -- I was -- and even to Ms. Steele's comment and, I guess, objection is that

1 the Creditors' Committee is going to be appointed, what, in about a week?

MS. STEELE: Yes, Your Honor.

2

3

4

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

19

THE COURT: Right. And they're going to get on this 5 right away. They're going to get on it immediately, like 6 happens in every case when there's this kind of thing at stake, and if they have an issue, they'll let you know about it and you'll see what it is and if they, you know, want to challenge it, they'll challenge it.

But they have to challenge it in accordance with due process and all those things and it'll be a -- probably a contested matter one way or another that would allow, ultimately, for that money to come back --

MR. HILLMAN: And I think --

THE COURT: -- but only after you win --

MR. HILLMAN: -- and I --

Well, not you. But, you know, the -- but THE COURT: $18 \parallel$ after the Committee wins or whoever has standing wins.

MR. HILLMAN: And I appreciate Your Honor's color and I think what we're saying is the same thing. That is, the 21 unwind is not the remedy at the final order. It is the ability 22 to bring a successful challenge under paragraph 43 of the DIP order to the debt, not to the roll-up. And if there's an issue 24 with the debt as a result of a successful challenge, then 25 \blacksquare there's an ability to deal with that.

THE COURT: Well, and then they're also saying the 1 2 priority and validity. I think they're saying --3 MR. HILLMAN: Oh, yes, yes. I'm sorry. 4 THE COURT: Yeah. 5 MR. HILLMAN: Yes. But not --6 THE COURT: But --7 MR. HILLMAN: -- not the roll --8 THE COURT: -- not just the debt. 9 MR. HILLMAN: Not the roll-up. The roll-up is a today issue. The roll-up cannot be undone by simply raising an 11 objection at the final hearing in 30 days. There is a path 12 under paragraph 43 to bring a challenge. 13 THE COURT: Um-hum. But 40 million is not coming in 14 otherwise, is what I'm hearing. Okay. 15 MS. STEELE: And I understand that, Your Honor, and 16 with those representations that the Court stated regarding the challenge and the ability of the Creditor's Committee, the U.S. 17 18 Trustee will withdraw its objection. 19 THE COURT: Oh, okay. Well, that's -- I'm glad to 20 hear it. And I don't think I said anything different than what's in there, so --22 MS. STEELE: Oh, you clarified, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: I --24 MR. HILLMAN: Yeah. 25 THE COURT: Color.

```
MR. HILLMAN: Because the color and clarification is
 1
 2 \parallel so critical to the DIP lender's perspective, I think it would
  be important for me to unequivocally state that once the Court
 4 enters the DIP order, the roll-up cannot be reviewed at the
 5 \parallel final order. The remedy for a Creditor's Committee or a party
   with interest withstanding is to bring a challenge under
 7
   paragraph 43 of the DIP order. Is that your understanding --
 8
             THE COURT: You could --
 9
             MR. HILLMAN: -- Your Honor?
10
             THE COURT:
                          That could not be clearer and I
11
   appreciate the candor and directness.
12
             MR. HILLMAN: Thank you.
13
             THE COURT: Ms. Geier?
             MS. GEIER: Your Honor, I think we heard that the
14
   United States Trustee's objection was withdrawn. So we are
16
   now --
17
             THE COURT:
                          I heard that.
18
             MS. GEIER:
                         -- fully consensual.
19
              (Laughter.)
20
             MS. GEIER:
                          I'm not sure who accomplished it, but --
21
             THE COURT:
                          So you have nothing --
                          -- here we are.
22
             MS. GEIER:
23
             THE COURT:
                          -- to address right now?
24
             MS. GEIER:
                          So --
25
             THE COURT:
                         Is that it or that -- or you still have
```

something to address?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

14

17

18

21

MS. GEIER: No, Your Honor. I came --

THE COURT: Oh.

MS. GEIER: -- back to the podium because I was hoping to seek your approval and also, you know, just to get on with the other items that we have after it because --

> THE COURT: Yeah. Yeah.

MS. GEIER: -- we do have a busy day.

THE COURT: And I just want to say that then, before you start, Ms. Geier, is that I did review the papers and the debtors are represented by some of the most sophisticated, knowledgeable, experienced professionals, not just legally but 13 financially and business-wise in every way.

And if there was one thing that came through from the papers, and even this last presentation, is that this 40 -- two crystal clear things. This 40 million was not coming unless they got the protections in the order and in the roll-up, as an example, and without the 40 million, this iconic brand was 19∥probably going to go into a fire sale unorganized, very valued depreciating liquidation immediately.

And, you know, business judgment, the business judgment in this case is far beyond me and I can't question the recommendations and advice of all these extremely knowledgeable professionals. It was -- it's something that needed to be done. The only way it could be done and is the only way that's

 $1 \parallel$ going to give everyone on that Bed Bath & Beyond side the 2 chance to make another thing happen that people didn't think 3 could happen. And I hope that's the way it goes, but either $4 \parallel$ way, there's a pathway to do it in an organized way without the 5 facilities that we have here. That pathway was burning and I'm 6 -- and I don't think that's the proper result. So I'll approve 7 the DIP financing order. 8 MS. GEIER: Thank you, Your Honor. 9 MR. MAYR: Your Honor --10 THE COURT: Oh. MR. MAYR: May I be heard? 11 12 THE COURT: I'm sorry. 13 MR. MAYR: Yeah. THE COURT: Who is that? 14 15 MR. MAYR: This is --16 THE COURT: Mr. Mayr? 17 Yeah. This is Mayr, Glenn Agre --MR. MAYR: There's a --18 THE COURT: 19 MR. MAYR: Bergman and Fuentes. 20 THE COURT: There's -- I'm on -- something happened on my screen here. 22 Okay. Go ahead, sir.

MR. MAYR: Can you hear me okay?

THE COURT: Yes. Yeah.

MR. MAYR: Great.

23

24

25

```
THE COURT: I just couldn't --
 1
 2
             MR. MAYR:
                        Thank you.
 3
             THE COURT: -- see you.
 4
             MR. MAYR:
                        Thank you. It's hard when you're not in
 5 the courtroom and I guess I'll start thank you for indulging me
 6 today to participate remotely. I just couldn't physically get
 7 there from Connecticut in time today. And I also want to say
 8 it's nice to see Mr. Sussberg without the full arm sling on
   that he had last week in court. He looks like he's -- oh, it's
10 there.
             THE COURT:
                        Oh. It's still --
11
12
             MS. GEIER: He still has it.
13
             THE COURT: It's still here. It's still --
             MR. MAYR: He --
14
15
             THE COURT: -- here, but he --
             MR. MAYR: He was wearing at the -- but he was
16
   wearing at the podium last week. So there's some --
17
             THE COURT:
18
                        Yeah.
19
             MR. MAYR: -- improvement. Uh-huh.
20
             THE COURT:
                         That was --
             MR. SUSSBERG: Progress.
21
22
             THE COURT: He showed it to me, though.
23
             MR. MAYR:
                        You know, as I mentioned, we represent a
24 number of investment funds and institutional investors who own
25 the unsecured bonds of the company. The unsecured bonds are,
```

 $1 \parallel$ as you have seen today, you know, a billion dollars and the 2 | largest part of -- the largest segment of the company's financed debt.

3

4

7

8

11

15

17

18

21

We're here to, you know -- we want to work 5 collaboratively with the debtor. We want to maximize value. 6 We want to be, you know, constructive to get to a resolution that works for all stakeholders.

We do have some concerns about the process, as you 9 would imagine, but -- and primarily, you know, with respect to 10 \parallel the cost and the timing of the process, we don't want a rushed process that's serving only the secured lender's agenda. not saying that's the case now, but it is something that we want to discuss with the debtors in terms of where they've been 14 and how they want to get to where they want to go.

We also did want to -- no objections today on an interim basis obviously given that you've already ruled, as well, but we do want -- you know, we do reserve rights to the final hearing. Particular would note that, you know, we may have issue with a certain incremental collateral or liens on 20 avoidance actions going to the DIP.

But at the end of the day, our clients, like you've 22∥ heard today, believe in this iconic brand and, in particular, the valuable asset in buybuy BABY, value NOLs and various other pockets of value that we've heard Mr. Huebner speak to today that we hope will lead to distributions well beyond the secured creditors in this case.

1

2

6

7

14

15

17

18

20

21

22

24

25

So, you know, we look forward to working with the 3 Court and the debtors' representatives to find the best 4 possible outcome here for the states and their stakeholders and 5 we reserve our rights for the final hearing.

THE COURT: All rights reserved. And I -- and if past is prolonged, Mr. Mayr, you know, the -- it seems like 8 there's been a lot of hard fought, but good faith negotiations between the parties that allowed things to happen, you know, 10 when things didn't seem like they could happen, when deadlines 11 were passing, and my hope is that it continues going forward. And it's not just my hope, it's my belief that that's the way 13 things will go.

> Share your hope. Thank you. MR. MAYR:

THE COURT: So thank you, sir. All right. So no -there's still no objections, Ms. Geier.

MS. GEIER: Thank you, Your Honor. I thought I was going to have to invoke the enshrined courtroom rule of no 19 take-backs.

(Laughter.)

MS. GEIER: But I'm glad that we did not reach that.

Your Honor, if we have closed the DIP chapter, I might move toward the next item on the agenda, which is the bidding procedures motion.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's go. Bidding procedures.

MS. GEIER: Bidding procedures.

THE COURT: Oh, there's a --

1

2

3

4

5

7

10

17

18

25

MS. GEIER: And just one --

THE COURT: I'm being handed a revised order.

MS. GEIER: That's correct, Your Honor. You are.

6 You're being handed a revised order that has been submitted to chambers. It is not on file yet, to my knowledge, but we wanted Your Honor to have what is the fully agreed form of order in your hands while we went through it.

But just to take a step back for one moment, the 11 original motion was filed at Docket Number 29. It contained all of the documents, so you didn't have to go hunting through the rest of the docket for the declarations and such. But what you'll see in Mister -- in the Lazard declaration and 15 Mr. Kurtz's declaration is a long process that has been ongoing 16 for some time seeking for strategic investors, going-concern buyers. There was financing searches in there, as well.

So really where we are now is the continuation of 19 that six-month process, except now we get to do it on a national stage. We get to do it with everyone aware that Bed Bath & Beyond and buybuy BABY are for sale. They're available to the highest bidder and we want those bidders to come forward and we are prepared to work with them as quickly as we need to, to document that transaction in whatever form it takes.

So obviously we are looking for, first and foremost,

1 a going-concern buyer for this company. We want -- we have not $2 \parallel$ only an iconic brand to protect, but we also have 14,000 employees that we want to be able to keep as many of those jobs 4 intact as possible.

I, you know, share everyone's experiences That's it. with Bed Bath and I want to be able to take my daughter college shopping there, too. I want to take my sons there college shopping if we're fortunate enough for them to make it to college. The daughter definitely. We'll see about the boys.

(Laughter.)

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

23

24

THE COURT: I hold out hope there, too.

And so to the extent --MS. GEIER:

MR. HUEBNER: Your Honor, I'm counsel to her son and I object.

(Laughter.)

MS. GEIER: I knew that he would retain excellent 17 counsel, so that is concerning for my future then.

So on this, there are a lot of documents attached 19 here and there's a full suite of there are stalking horse 20 bidding protections. You know, there's a form APA. There's the form and notice of auctions. There are notice of procedures for the assumption and assignment of those contracts and leases attached should we find that going-concern buyer.

That's because we cannot afford delay in having all 25 of that in place should someone come knocking on our door. So 1 we want to make sure that those items are in place and we have $2 \parallel \text{very specific milestones to meet and, you know, if it's not}$ going-concern buyer, then maybe it's these iconic brands. And 4 certainly these iconic brands have a lot of value and will 5 continue to this day.

You know, we know that brands like Toys 'R Us, they -- the actual stores didn't make it through the restructuring process, but the name did and so it's now reviving and that's, at the very least, the story we want to be $10\,
Vert$ able to tell here for Bed Bath & Beyond and buybuy BABY.

6

7

11

17

21

22

So with that, Your Honor, the -- I think the most 12 important aspects of this are the tight timeline. So we would 13 have an auction. We have a bid deadline of May 28th. party wants to serve as our stalking horse bidder, that's May 22nd, so not a lot of time from now. Those are dictated by the DIP required milestones, so these are not flexible end dates, although we do have built in flexibility in the motion 18 \parallel to move dates around. At the end of the day, our DIP budget -our DIP order says what it says and we have to have that sale hearing and order approved on June 7th in order to get that approved.

We have added in a couple of extra dates into the schedule, so adequate assurance packages need to be delivered by May 29th, which is the day after the bid deadline to ensure 25 that landlords have adequate time to review those packages.

We have moved the objection deadline to two days 2 before the sale hearing to June 5th instead of June -- so 3 June 7th would be the sale hearing, June 5th being the $4 \parallel$ objection deadline. So we are -- we have made a few changes 5 around the edges, but the absolute dates have not changed, 6 which is that June 7th end date. That's 45 days from the $7 \parallel$ petition date under the DIP milestones and we will use every bit of that time to ensure that we get the best value possible for the company and/or its brands.

One thing I do want to flag is that this motion does 11 not cover one-off lease sale -- you know, one-off lease assumption assignments, one-off lease termination agreements. Those will be pursuant to a separate motion that we are getting on file as soon as humanly possible.

And so you won't see that in these documents but just 16 going to point out those are not covered here.

THE COURT: Those are things that are percolating or that those are things that are -- that you're talking about now --

> MS. GEIER: Exactly.

1

10

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

THE COURT: -- the one-offs?

MS. GEIER: Exactly. You know, we do have A&G Realty as the sort of the restructuring real estate advisors involved in this process, as well. So they're out there soliciting and looking for potential parties that may be interested in an

1 assumption and assignment of certain leases or with particular landlords may want to enter into those individual termination agreements as we exit the stores over time through the goingout-of-business sales.

5

6

7

8

9

17

25

But for right now, you know, this is our main primary absolute focus, but we will be doing that sort of simultaneously to ensure that we have maximized all value and resources that we have to monetize.

So there are a couple of declarations attached to $10\,
Vert$ this motion that I just want to flag all together at Docket 11 Number 29. So I just want to ensure that those get into the 12 record. There is the Lazard declaration. Mr. Kurtz also 13 served as declarant for this motion, as well as Elise Frejka. She is the party that reviewed the consumer data privacy provisions to sort of get out in front of any concerns where we have -- if we have consumer data involved here.

It's her review of the policy that just says we're 18 not asking for relief around it. We're just -- it merely says a consumer privacy omnibus likely is not required here simply because we have done all this review and, in her opinion --21 she's done this in many, many cases -- in her opinion, this data and what the bounds would be to make it part of a sale process is sort of laid out in there and why we don't really need a consumer privacy omnibus here.

THE COURT: I'm sure the U.S. --

MS. STEELE: I --

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

11

12

15

16

17

19

20

25

THE COURT: -- Trustee will --

MS. STEELE: Yes, Your Honor. We preliminarily 4 reviewed the privacy policy and we have had some preliminary discussions and we don't believe that a privacy ombudsman will be necessary based on the specific language that allows the company to enter into a sale and give the information to the perspective purchaser.

So as we stand today, we don't believe that we need 10 one.

> THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Steele. Thank you.

MS. GEIER: So with that, Your Honor, I do have the redlines in front of me if there are any specific questions that you have or would like to go over. I'm happy --

> THE COURT: The --

MS. STEELE: -- to do so.

THE COURT: The bid protections, the expense 18 reimbursement and the break-up fee --

MS. STEELE: That's right.

THE COURT: -- the way I understand it is that that is also going to be the subject of negotiation and back and forth as to the stalking horse. And then the -- because this is a little bit of an unusual situation how that works going forward in terms of the substantiation of the fee.

MS. STEELE: Yes, Your Honor. There are bid

 $1 \parallel \text{protections requested in this motion order.}$ The reason why 2 \parallel they're requested here, as opposed to at a sale hearing, is simply because we don't have much time in the schedule to come 4 back and see if we can get that.

5

11

12

14

16

17

22

23

If a going-concern buyer comes forward and they have 6 put together a package that says, you know, this is going to be a fantastic stalking horse bidder or I -- not just going concern, but any package that we think is -- should serve as a stalking horse bidder, we don't want to disrupt that process by 10 coming back. So we have requested a reasonable -- what we think are reasonable bid protections, but we will continue to negotiate those. We are not automatically handing those out, 13 by any means.

Okay. And then by then they'll be a THE COURT: 15 committee, I think, and they'll maybe chime in, as well. They're a consultation party, right?

Yes. Absolutely, Your Honor. MS. GEIER: And they $18 \parallel$ have the -- that was one of the points requested by the United States Trustee was to make sure that the Committee, when appointed, would be a consultation party and have all of the same notice rights involvement and so they have been incorporated, as well. So yes.

THE COURT: Great. All right. I obviously have 24 not -- I think it is on the docket at -- looks like at 3:24 25 today it got on the docket.

MS. GEIER: Fantastic.

THE COURT: So --

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

17

18

19

Fantastic news. MS. GEIER:

THE COURT: -- you have got quite the team going on 5 back there.

MS. GEIER: I know. I told you. I went back to my back to my desk for one second, submitted it, came back. It's very quick.

THE COURT: All right. But I obviously haven't had a chance to review it, but -- and I don't know if you -- were most of these comments from the U.S. Trustee or --

MS. GEIER: That's correct, Your Honor. So majority of the United States Trustee and also a couple of landlord tweaks, just around the timeline in particular. The United States Trustee made sure that the Committee was involved as a noticed party throughout. Those were the key -- sort of key points.

THE COURT: All right. So it maybe just -- as long as those parties have it and you represent to me that they have signed off on, you know, the changes that you -- sounds like you have agreed to already, then, again, it's a different -and I'm not going to say just completely unique, but it's a different situation because you've had -- it looks like you have had a semi-wind down process going on for quite some time and a sale process, in a sense, going on for a long time and

1 there isn't a long timeline on the -- on trying to get it done. 2 So I think these are the circumstances in which you 3 have to make adjustments and not have the usual procedure, 4 because the usual procedure just doesn't really fit this time. 5 And I appreciate that you worked with the U.S. Trustee's Office and the landlords in getting it done, so I'm sure I'm fine --7 I'm sure I'm going to be fine with it, okay? I just --MS. GEIER: Thank you very much. THE COURT: I don't want to keep everybody here while 10 I flip through the redline. I don't --MS. GEIER: Yes. And apologies for submitting it on 12 the docket so later in the day. We try to make it so that everyone can get their comments in and get heard and I think, at least, everyone could represent if necessary, that they are

THE COURT: Yeah. That'll be fine. And you know We didn't do that with the DIP order. 18 what? Is that in final 19 form?

signed off. I think we do have landlord representation in the

MS. GEIER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It is in final form?

courtroom today. If you'd like to hear from them --

That was the submitted final order. MS. GEIER: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

8

9

11

15

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

Final form of interim order. MS. GEIER:

THE COURT: Okay. Great. Come on up.

1

2

4

7

8

9

11

15

17

MR. HAIG: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Robert Lee 3 Haig, Kelley, Drye & Warren.

Your Honor, we represent approximately 16 landlords $5\parallel$ at over 80 locations at this point, including Oak Street Capital, the headquarter's landlord, 11 other locations, site centers, Kite Realty Group, Brookfield, a number of other landlords, Your Honor.

Your Honor, these procedures are far from perfect and 10 \parallel they certainly are unusual, but we absolutely understand the situation the company's in. We can't promise you that we won't need some of your help if it does turn out that there is a going-concern buyer and there's adequate assurance issues and we need some time to assess those.

But with the changes that debtors' counsel was 16 willing to make, and the lenders -- and we understand there's a big team and there's a lot going on -- it's a very tight, 18 compressed process, Your Honor. And even with the adjustments 19 that they have made, it may be very difficult for our clients to get the information, adequate insurance information, assess it and know whether or not they have to object. But given the reality to the situation and the movements that were made, you know, we're willing to move forward with this process, and specifically under the understanding that this is for a goingconcern bid, something that may save the company. And at the

1 process, we're doing one-off lease assignments, et cetera. Ιt 2 would be subject to a separate set of procedures.

> That's -- yeah. THE COURT:

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

17

23

24

MR. HAIG: So we really appreciate the work of the debtors' counsel, the debtors' team and everybody else involved in getting back to us quickly and promptly. It's certainly far from perfect, Your Honor, but at this point, we were signed off. I also --

THE COURT: Well, that --

MR. HAIG: -- worked in coordination with Leslie --I'm sorry -- Laurel Roglen from Ballard Spahr, Scott Fleischer from Damon Barclay. They're also here. They can get up if needed, but they were also involved in the process and we certainly appreciate their help in helping us get comments to counsel for the debtors and great response from the Kirkland and the Cole Schotz teams, Your Honor.

Well, I'm glad to hear that. I'm not THE COURT: 18 surprised to hear it, but I'm glad you're here and I appreciate 19 your working with those things and I'm certainly here to help where I can. I try to be reasonable and I try to be -- give people a fair shot at doing what they need to do and having enough time to do what they need to do with regard working with a compressed time frame here.

And the way I'm seeing this, sir, is in a way this is 25 setting up some guidelines for sales that are to be determined

1 that are -- that's not even really here yet. It's almost like $2 \parallel$ the motion is going to be when the actual bids come in and 3 people and it comes before the Court and you reserve your 4 | rights. Everybody reserves their rights and we'll deal with it 5 as best we can.

MR. HAIG: Thank you, Your Honor. Happy to answer any other questions you may have.

8 THE COURT: No, no. I have no more questions. 9 That's good. Thank you --

MR. HAIG: Thank you very much.

6

7

10

11

12

14

18

20

21

23

THE COURT: -- sir. I appreciate it.

MS. STEELE: Yes, Your Honor. Fran Steele on behalf 13 of the U.S. Trustee.

As counsel said, we did provide comments. We asked 15 for certain provisions to be incorporated, which they were, 16 certain deleted. And so based on that, we have no objection to 17 the form of order, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Great. Does anyone else wish to be 19 heard?

(No audible response.)

THE COURT: Okay. Having heard no response about the 22 bid procedures order as revised will also -- is also approved.

MS. GEIER: Thank you very much, Your Honor. 24 appreciate your time today. I'm going to cede the podium to my 25 partner, Derek Hunter.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

7

8

9

11

12

14

15

17

18

21

22

24

25

MR. HUNTER: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. HUNTER: Derek Hunter from Kirkland & Ellis on 5 behalf of the debtors. I'll see if I can't pick up the pace of 6 the agenda items a little bit here.

THE COURT: Are you saying it was slow before or was it me?

MR. HUNTER: No, no, no. Hopefully these are less 10 controversial.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. HUNTER: The next one being the cash management 13 motion. That's agenda item 3 at Docket Number 18, Your Honor.

> THE COURT: Yep.

MR. HUNTER: By this motion, we're seeking to 16 continue to operate our cash management system in the ordinary course. It looks a lot like a cash management system you have probably seen in other retail cases, store level deposit accounts, there are collection accounts. They're swept daily 20 and we have 14 disbursement accounts.

We also make inter-company transfers in the ordinary course. We're not seeking to make intercompany transfers to any non-debtors during the cases. We pay standard bank fees and processing fees and the like.

We don't have a redline to hand up. The U.S.

1 Trustee's Office has been great working late and over the 2 weekend and so all -- you know, their comments are already 3 incorporated. They may have statements they want on 345(b), I 4 understand, but the changes are in the order as I understand 5 it.

On the business forms, we're going to print the DIP $7 \parallel$ label on new checks, but otherwise exhaust existing checks. 8 And then on 345 (b), we have agreed to a 30-day extension or suspension of that requirement and we'll work through it with 10∥ the U.S. Trustee and we'll try to work something out, I think, 11 by the time of the final order for that issue.

THE COURT: On the normal course, the U.S. Trustee's 13 Office asked for the DIP to -- designation to be on the 14 accounts, but maybe --

MS. STEELE: Right. We did agree with that, Your 16 Honor.

THE COURT: So -- and really, everyone knows Yeah. $18 extbf{||}$ that Bed Bath & Beyond is a DIP at this point. So maybe not a 19 DIP --

MR. HUNTER: Yeah.

6

12

15

17

20

21

22

24

THE COURT: -- but a debtor.

MR. HUNTER: Yes. I think that theme will come up a 23 little bit later, Your Honor.

I would -- I think Ms. Etlin would chastise me if I 25 \parallel did not reiterate that payroll is this week and so it's

1 critical we get access to our bank accounts opened up. $2 \parallel$ cash management here and wages next, obviously critical for us to be able to, you know, make payroll this week as we expect to.

> THE COURT: All right.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

17

22

24

MS. STEELE: Yeah. Yeah.

I'll cede at the moment --MR. HUNTER: Yeah.

MS. STEELE: Thank you.

MR. HUNTER: -- at the podium.

MS. STEELE: If Your Honor would just indulge me just a moment, we have no objection to the cash management order. 12 We resolved our objection with the debtor. The order provides for a limited waiver of Section 345 providing for a 30-day 14 review by the U.S. Trustee.

And recent bank failures highlight the importance of 16 the debtors' compliance with Section 345 for the benefit of all the stakeholders. And as Your Honor is aware, Section 345 18 places an obligation on the debtor-in-possession to require 19 protections for its monies from institutions which hold such 20 monies. And the U.S. Trustee, in its advisory role, assists with this protection by its entry into uniform depository agreements. Those are UDAs, which obligate the depository to maintain collateral of deposits, which exceeds the FDIC limits.

And here, as a result of the importance of 25 \parallel protections of the debtors' funds and the requirements of Section 345, the order does provide a limited waiver of Section 345 and an opportunity for the U.S. Trustee to review.

So, Your Honor, we're hopeful that the debtors will act promptly to ensure full compliance with Section 345 and we reserve our right to be heard at the final hearing.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. STEELE: Thank you.

THE COURT: Well, and again, I appreciate you working together with the debtor and counsel to get it done.

MS. STEELE: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Steele.

All right. And I have reviewed that order, you know. I can't say I read every single word in there because that

wouldn't --14

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

MR. HUNTER: Understood.

THE COURT: -- be true. But I tried to read as much as I could. And there's a lot of words again, but it doesn't seem like it's anything unusual or inappropriate, so I'll approve the order especially with the consent of the United States Trustee's Office.

MS. STEELE: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. HUNTER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. HUNTER: Next item on the agenda is our wages 25 motion, item number 4, at Docket Number 11. Again, another one 1 where we shared with the U.S. Trustee and worked through their $2 \parallel$ issues in advance. This is a standard wages motion, Your 3 Honor, seeking to pay ordinary course amounts, amounts that 4 could come due post-petition, as well.

We have 14,000 employees, as we have talked about. 6 Over 12,000 of those are store level employees. They're $7 \parallel$ hearing a lot in the news and it's critical to be able to 8 reinforce that, you know, they're going to get paid for their work, you know, post-Chapter 11 filing. I'm happy to -- and I 10∥ would flag no amounts above the statutory cap. We're not seeking relief for that. There's nothing that implicates 503(c) here, so we think it's a --

THE COURT: Even after the final order no amount? MR. HUNTER: We don't expect there to be any amounts. I will come back to you if there is, but we don't expect there to be even on a final basis, but certainly not today.

But to -- right. So there's really two THE COURT: $18 \parallel$ questions I had was -- one was whether, on the final order basis, you're looking for in excess of the 507 caps and you just you may be. Is that --

MR. HUNTER: We do not expect to.

THE COURT: But you -- yeah.

MR. HUNTER: But yes.

5

11

12

13

14

17

20

21

22

23

24

Yeah. And the second one was whether --THE COURT: 25∥I'm just not 100 percent clear on it, but whether you're also

1 seeking to pay expenses -- amounts that were due before the $2 \parallel \text{period}$ or that even are, you know, maybe several months old and for --

MR. HUNTER: No. Well, generally, Your Honor, we're seeking to continue ordinary course so, you know, we --

THE COURT: Just ordinary course.

MR. HUNTER: Exactly. Exactly.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. That's what I wanted to know. Thank you.

MR. HUNTER: Great. And unless you have any further questions or anyone in the courtroom, we ask that enter the wages order.

THE COURT: All right. That is also approved.

MR. HUNTER: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

MR. HUNTER: Moving along. Next one is the store closing motion. That's at item number 5, Docket 28.

As you heard from my colleagues, Mr. Sussberg and 19 Ms. Geier, you know, while we're continuing to market our 20 business, we do intend to immediately commence liquidating our stores. You know, in our business judgment, we do need to begin that process in an effort to maximize value. So this really is critical, Your Honor. You know, I do think it looks like other store closing motions you may have seen in the past. 25 We're seeking to assume a consulting agreement with Hilco and

others.

1

2

8

11

15

16

18

20

21

22

We're seeking to close, you know -- begin the process 3 for all of our stores. It's wave five of our closing process, 4 which I think you heard has been going on for some time now out 5 of court, and we're seeking authority to pay customary bonuses 6 to our store level employees to complete the process in making 7 modifications to our customer programs.

This is one that typically the landlord bar care about. In particular, they reached out soon after the order 10∥ was filed. Again, they were great working with us getting us comments last night hours after the motion was filed. 12 worked through that and I think we have resolution on their issues through some new language in the orders, which I don't believe you have, but I can hand up in a second if you'd like to flip through.

Before I do, just two things that I would -- I 17 promised certain counsel I'd say on the record. One is that, you know, the -- it is important to certain landlords' counsel that we work through side letters with their particular landlord --

> THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. HUNTER: -- to govern the GOB process. We have, you know, obviously no issues with that and, you know, we're going to start that process expeditiously and we plan to work through it in good faith with them.

It's typically not something you can get done in a $2 \parallel$ day and so, you know, they don't have us a certain that's 3 necessarily locked in now, but they're willing to support the 4 interim orders, I understand, based on the representation that $5 \parallel$ we'll work with them quickly and in good faith to get the side 6 letters for those that want it.

1

7

8

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And second, Your Honor, there is a provision in the interim order that requires certain parties to surrender property if it is property of the debtors. I think that's 10∥ standard in these types of orders. But, you know, of course there could be a debate about is it -- you know, what is the debtors in property, does the landlord think they have an interest in property. I think, you know, the landlords, their rights are reserved on that front. If they find that there's some issue there, they can come back to you on it.

So I just want to make those couple statements on the I do have a redline. If I may approach, I can give it record. to Your Honor.

> THE COURT: Okay. Yep. Thank you.

So, Ms. Steele, this is -- this reflects your comments, as well?

MS. STEELE: It does, Your Honor, except I do have one comment that I'd like to put on the record, one objection.

> THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MS. STEELE: But other than that, it does reflect all

of our comments.

1

2

3

7

8

9

17

18

21

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HUNTER: And so what I'd suggest is that I don't $4 \parallel$ believe it's really a language issue, so I'm happy to answer 5 questions but I'd let Ms. Steele kind of, you know, talk about what her issue is and then I'm happy to address it.

MS. STEELE: Thank you. Fran Steele on behalf of the U.S. Trustee.

Your Honor, our only objection is that the order $10\parallel$ provides that you have 30 days to return goods to the stores, but only 14 days to use your gift card and we would suggest to 12 the Court that those days should be the same, that the gift card should be extended to the 30 days as when you can return 14 something because it seems unfair to the consumer to go into 15 the store on day 16 to return something and have in their pocket a gift card only to get to the register to find out that they can return something, but that they can't use the gift card, and we would suggest that it's just more practical for those days to be the same. And based on that, we would object 20 to that provision.

THE COURT: all right. I understand. I understand 22∥ what you're saying, but isn't -- I guess two things. Isn't 23 that kind of classic business judgment and also isn't that 24 classic business judgement as to whether they might think it's 25 better to get somebody in the store with a gift card that -- so 1 they go buy other things, like they used to do, and extend that period?

MS. STEELE: I agree --

THE COURT: I --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

18

22

23

24

MS. STEELE: -- Your Honor. But --

THE COURT: I know. But I can't -- I don't feel I can force the debtor to do that. I think that's a business judgment.

MS. STEELE: True.

THE COURT: All --

MS. STEELE: And we have asked the debtor to extend 12 the time for the gift cards, even if they -- if it, perhaps, goes out one further week. But even with the limited time, the case was just filed yesterday and I don't know -- I mean, I 15 couldn't figure it out, but I don't even know if they have until the full weekend, next weekend or does it cut off on Saturday.

It just seems like a very limited amount of time to 19 use those gift cards and we would suggest that it should be if 20 it's not extended to 30 days, perhaps 21 just allowing a little more time for the gift cards.

MS. CORDRY: And, Your Honor --

THE COURT: Are you saying Mr. Hunter --

MS. CORDRY: -- this is Mr. Cordry, if I could speak 25 to this point?

Oh, yes. THE COURT:

1

2

4

7

8

11

12

13

17

18

19

22

23

MS. CORDRY: From the National Association of 3 Attorneys General, Karen Cordry.

These orders, yes, these are very standard orders. 5 We spent a lot of time starting in the Great Recession negotiating the terms of these orders and they have practically become I think black letter law almost at this point.

But the point about gift cards was one of the most heavily negotiated and fought over issues in many, many, many of these cases. I don't recall any of them being as short as 14 days. I think there's some real notice issues to customers.

And one of my other questions would be, if you do start limiting it to that kind of time period, what notice are customers going to be given; how much information is going to go out to them to tell them that these cards they were promised they could use forever are now going to be no good after only 14 days and, of course, the 14 highest priced days of the sale.

You know, we have litigated over that and I think the states might be willing to come back in and push the issue further on that point. So that is definitely one of the points that we have a concern with in the order.

Also related to that is the question about latent defects. We have had language in other orders that are much more clear about the fact that people can -- speaking about 25 this point about returning items, that people could return

1 items if they buy it and it has a latent defect in it. I would 2 | like to suggest that that language could, perhaps, be tweaked 3 slightly.

4

7

8

10

11

15

17

18

22

23

24

Two other points I was concerned about but seem like 5 they're okay is, one, is the question, I just want to emphasize that sign-walkers and so forth that there could be safety issues in that so that I just want to make sure that debtors' aware that we -- the states would retain that right under the health and safety governmental regulation kind of piece of it.

And the last piece was the question about personally identifiable information. The motion, at one point, said, yes, we're going to make sure there's no information passed on, but at another point said we're going to use reasonably commercially reasonable efforts.

But I do think the motion -- the final order is clear that they will destroy the information. It will -- none of it will be passed on with registers and so forth. So I do come back to just basically those two points, the gift cards and the latent defects that I think could be dealt with and then I would go back to the states and say, you know, it fits within our black letter law, but think right now, those two provisions are somewhat less clear than what we have used in the past.

THE COURT: Mr. Hunter, do you want to respond? MR. HUNTER: Yes, Your Honor. So I think, if I hear 25 right on the last two, the sign-walker issue and the privacy

1 information, it sounds like maybe those are final order issues.
2 You know, I do think the order is clear that health and safety
3 laws, you know, we have to comply with those.

MS. STEELE: Yeah.

4

5

6

7

10

11

16

17

18

22

23

24

MR. HUNTER: We heard about -- our expert had submitted a declaration in connection with bidding procedures on privacy and so I think we have actually put information out on that front on a broader basis and so the debtors are taking that very seriously. So that's what I'd say on those two.

Backing up to latent defects, the order has clear language that the debtors will comply with all state and federal laws relating to warrantees -- or latent defects. I'm happy though to engage with Ms. Cordry on a final order if they're -- it could be clearer, but that's obviously the intent and so if it's a language issue, we have no problem there.

THE COURT: Did you hear that, Ms. Cordry?

MS. CORDRY: Yes. And we do have some language that I can pass on, because I do think it's a little clearer because people might not know what a latent defect is, but the way we have used it in some other orders does spell out what the problem is but, yes, I'll be happy to pass that onto him.

MR. HUNTER: Okay.

THE COURT: Because I read it and I thought I saw the provision about latent defects and maybe it's not clear exactly what a latent defect is, but if you could work out that

1 language real quickly that would be great.

MR. HUNTER: Okay. We will do that.

THE COURT: All right.

2

3

4

9

17

18

23

24

MR. HUNTER: And then on the gift card issue, I 5 totally understand where the U.S. Trustee is coming from. You know, Your Honor, this is an economic issue. I think you pointed out, it's a business judgment issue. You know, I think it's a good point from a notice perspective.

I don't think anyone is surprised or doesn't know 10∥ that Bed Bath is here. You know, frankly, our recent troubles and challenges have been very well publicized. Recent filings 12 have said point-blank if something doesn't happen, we will file for bankruptcy; we are considering bankruptcy. It's been very clear. So I don't think the consumer was not on notice that 15 there was risk in this area. And, of course, it's a little different to file and -- and make it very clear you have 14 days. We understand that, but we have a noticing agent.

We're doing broad notice on top of, I think, the fact 19 that this is very mainstream at this point and I would just emphasize, again, you know, it's economic. It's part of a hard negotiation about the DIP budget, what we were going to fund, what we weren't and, you know, it costs \$10 million a week for gift card redemption.

So it's a material number that in the context of a 25 \parallel lot of issues, a lot of things that we did get covered, you

1 know, through the DIP, Ms. Geier walked through it, you know, 2 specific reserves to make sure we can do the right thing in this case. This is one where we think 14 days was the right balance between all those competing interests and that's why we 5 think it's appropriate, Your Honor.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Your Honor?

6

7

8

11

17

19

22

23

MS. CORDRY: And, again, our point would be that if you are going to have that short of a period, which is, again, short -- and that's very different from knowing they're in 10∥ bankruptcy. I may know that you're in bankruptcy, but unless you are specifically telling me in those notice provisions, 12 perhaps emailing to all those customers, that you have all those -- information that you send out emails on -- unless I'm getting notice that's telling me that my gift card is no good after 10 days -- or 14 days, I'm sure, that's a very different thing from knowing that there's a bankruptcy and I would want to be sure that that is emphasized, that that needs to be part 18 of the noticing provisions.

MR. HUNTER: On the notice front, the liquidator is going to be issuing a press release that has these details. it's going to be a literal press release to the world and these details will on there.

THE COURT: And on the website?

24 MR. HUNTER: It's on the website. I checked this 25 morning.

THE COURT: Did you get that --

MS. CORDRY: And emails to customers will -- can an email be sent to all your customer base?

MR. HUNTER: I don't know if we have that kind of information. There's a --

THE COURT: You do. My wife gets those emails all the time.

(Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

14

16

17

21

23

MR. HUNTER: I don't know if she'll be happy about 10 more.

MS. CORDRY: And it may not be everyone who has a 12 gift card, but everyone who was one of your customers should be 13 able to get that notice.

I mean, in a way, couldn't you frame it THE COURT: 15 as a positive almost? Gift cards expire in 14 days, so come in quickly. I don't know.

MR. HUNTER: No. Your Honor, we're doing everything 18 we can to publicize the liquidation sale and emphasize these 19 provisions. If there's supplemental things we can do, we're 20 happy to go back and look at it.

We are noticing our customers far and wide on the impacts of liquidation, what their customer programs -- you know, what this means with respect to the customer programs. think they're rolling. And if we're not already emailing all 25 customers that we have email addresses for, we will do that.

THE COURT: Okay. Did you hear that, Ms. Cordry?

MS. CORDRY: I hear that and the states will consider whether that's sufficient or whether they want to object to a final order --

> THE COURT: Well --

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

17 I

20

MS. CORDRY: -- on still the same issues, because there are some other points that are out there, as well. you.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. DALE: Your Honor, may I?

THE COURT: Yes, please.

MR. DALE: Charles Dale of Proskauer Rose with I represent 6th Street Specialty Lending. 13 Mr. Hillman.

Judge, we spent a lot of time calibrating the 15 interests of stakeholders that had pre-petition priority claims just like consumers. You heard today about money that will be spent to pay freight vendors, taxing authorities. 18 substantial amount of money will be devoted to employees, 19 including employees who may have claims under the WARN act.

Your Honor, this is an eight figure liability that we 21 have provided for and we have calibrated what consumers ought to get and I think it's safe to say, given the media coverage of this case, Judge, there's not a consumer in America or several other countries that doesn't know Bed Bath is in 25 bankruptcy and they ought to use their gift cards.

Even Mr. Sussberg's mother-in-law called him to get advice on that.

THE COURT: Yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

11

15

17

22

23

24

25

MR. DALE: Thank you --

THE COURT: I --

MR. DALE: -- Your Honor.

THE COURT: I would say that I think, you know, the -- you know, as the coupon was so popular and effective, also I think Bed Bath & Beyond has become effective with that $10 \parallel$ because my wife does tell me, you know, about the coupon and I was going to, you know, go to get whatever it was. But -- so I 12 think that's an easy thing to send to people and I think people do pay attention to that and I didn't realize the number was 14 that big. I had no idea that the number was that big.

And just anecdotally, I think there's a big 16 difference between notice of a bankruptcy and notice of how long you have to redeem a gift card. I agree with that point. 18∥But on the notice issue, anecdotally, when I came in today, the 19 guard said to me, "I hear you got Bed Bath & Beyond," and I said, "I do." He said, "Three days to return" -- "three days to get your 20 percent." So --

(Laughter.)

THE COURT: -- that --

MS. CORDRY: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- so people are aware and I think if

```
1 they --
 2
             MS. CORDRY: Yeah.
 3
             THE COURT: -- if you put -- especially if you put an
   email, maybe if it can be done, all the marketing people in a
 5
   positive way, maybe that'll be --
 6
             MR. HUNTER: And, Your Honor, I --
 7
             MR. DALE:
                        Thank you.
 8
             MR. HUNTER: -- while I was on the side, I found out
   that if you are a customer of Bed Bath, you have already
   received this. They have actual -- the company's actually
11
   already sent it out.
12
                        I'm sorry?
             THE COURT:
13
             MR. HUNTER: The company's already sent out an
   email --
14
15
             THE COURT:
                         Oh.
             MR. HUNTER: -- with these deadlines.
16
17
             THE COURT:
                         See?
18
             MS. CORDRY: Okay.
19
             THE COURT:
                         I knew you could do it.
20
             MS. CORDRY: I would say that the -- Your Honor, I
   would say that the website does not have that on there yet it
   does not appear, so if it could be added to the -- that front
   page of the website, that would be very helpful to people, as
24
   well, I think.
```

MR. HUNTER: We -- it's in the FAQs related to

25

1 Chapter 11. I clicked through it today. But we'll -- if 2 there's a way to make it more prominent, we'll work on that but I do know it's on the website.

MS. CORDRY: Well --

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

17

18

20

21

24

25

THE COURT: All right.

MS. CORDRY: -- it's not on the front of the website, because I'm looking at it right now.

THE COURT: Oh, okay.

MS. CORDRY: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much, 10 Your Honor.

> THE COURT: Thank you.

> > MS. STEELE: Right.

MS. STEELE: Your Honor, the U.S. Trustee understands the comments. We're disappointed for those customers that go in on day 15 or take their gift cards when they go to return things, but we understand it's their business judgment. But we're hopeful this doesn't set a precedent in further cases that the gift card return policy will be so short.

THE COURT: Yeah. I -- the only precedent is 19 that I think it's a -- there's a business judgment precedent --

THE COURT: -- that I -- and this is unique to these circumstances that they have this compressed timeline and all that and I just can't -- I don't think I'm permitted to substitute my judgment for theirs on this point.

MS. STEELE: And I understand that. I just wanted to

voice our concerns.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

14

17

23

THE COURT: It's a legitimate --

MS. STEELE: Thank you.

THE COURT: -- concern. You and Ms. Cordry voiced it very well.

MS. STEELE: Thank you.

THE COURT: And it seems like someone else wants to voice a concern.

MR. FLEISCHER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 10∥ Fleischer of Barclay Damon on behalf of a number of the landlords, as was referenced earlier today. Just a narrow 12 issue to change the subject off of gift cards here.

THE COURT: Um-hum.

MR. FLEISCHER: One aspect of the sale guidelines, 15 right, which cover these store closing sales, allows the debtors to use the verbiage "going out of business" on their large exterior signs in certain shopping centers now. $18 \parallel$ thought that that was not really the best way to introduce the 19 public to these sort of new and improved store closing sales. 20 And for the landlord parochial interests, we don't want a giant sign that says going out of business when there doesn't have to 22 be.

So especially now with the posture of the case being 24 that there is still a possibility of a sale out there, whether 25 \parallel in part or in whole, who knows, it didn't seem appropriate to

1 have going out of business out there right now. And I 2 understand this is probably something the debtors don't want 3 either. I would imagine this was probably something that $4 \parallel$ was -- that turned on the finances of the sales and they $5 \parallel \text{probably think they can } -- \text{ maybe the lenders think they can get}$ 6 some more value out of it if it says going out of business. $7 \parallel$ But it seems like there should be, perhaps, a date when we can pivot from something that says "store closing," which is accurate now to "going out of business" down the road, such as pass the bid deadline if there's no going concern, you know, buyer that comes available. So --

THE COURT: And you're how many -- how many stores do 13 you represent?

MR. FLEISCHER: I'm still getting a count. So, so far, let's see, one -- looks like five groups of landlords. have: RPT Realty, DLC Management, Inland Commercial Real Estate Services, Rivercrest Realty Associates, Westfield and possibly others. Still gathering the list. Somewhere in the double digits. I don't know how high it's gotten so far.

THE COURT: One -- all right. Well, Mr. Hunter, do you want to respond?

MR. HUNTER: Yes.

11

12

14

17

18

20

22

23

24

THE COURT: I thought it did say things like you could say things like in the general area of going out of 25 business and --

MR. HUNTER: Yes. The order does provide, you know, $2 \parallel I$ think, customary latitude to advertise these sales as the 3 liquidators and the company sees fit. It's a business judgment $4\parallel$ issue. And so -- but, of course, it relates to costs and the 5 sales being effective but, you know, the advertisements are, 6 you know -- cost money.

1

7

8

11

14

17

19

We have planned for these going out of business sales. We have been doing them already. And at the end of the day, while we are, as Mr. Sussberg puts it, running out every ground ball and, you know, we hope that there's a value maximizing transaction here, the company's business judgment is to begin store liquidation sales immediately and what that goes 13 along with.

And whether every store says going out of business or 15 not, I don't know. I leave that to the company and Hilco. But they're going to pursue it promptly in the way that they seek to maximize value and that's really all we're trying to do at 18 the end of the day.

Of course, if we had -- if we thought it made sense 20 to wait around for weeks without, you know, going out of business signs on the stores, that's what we would do. But practical reality is that's just not where we are right now and we want to maximize value regardless of what happens. do -- you know, we think doing that just, you know, requires us 25 to have this flexibility, which is customary, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mister -- and there's nothing 2 that prevents you from speaking with debtors or Hilco or whatever and Mr. Fleischer and trying to work that out. Maybe $4 \parallel$ if it's a cost issue, you -- and you want it, you can help them defray the cost somehow or another. I'm just trying to offer solutions --

1

5

6

7

8

11

17

18

22

23

24

MR. FLEISCHER: That's an interesting ask, Your Honor. I think we'll have to think about a cost problem. Again, I think it was more of a it's a combination of their 10 \parallel just being a notice issue almost to the public, right, that is not necessarily going out of business. We all hope that it's not going out of business. So to have those signs up there just doesn't seem like the best way to start. And, again, they do have that flexibility and, you know, we talk about whether there should, you know, be a carve out of some kind perhaps, but it did seem like at least if not a bid deadline issue, a final order issue to have actual going out of business.

It's very common in these orders that at -- on the 19 interim, you can't say going out of business. You could stay store closing sale and everything and we have, you know, plenty of samples with Kirkland and others with those orders. usually triggered by an actual shift to an entire GOB through a separate order or a final order on store closing.

THE COURT: But -- and I appreciate what you're saying and what you're saying makes sense, but I turn to the 1 same thing that I said to Ms. Steele is that, how do I -- if 2 \parallel the experts say this is how they want to do it to maximize the sale, how do I say that's not the right way to do it. I just I don't know how. I don't think I have that authority, frankly, and, you know, I'm -- you can do a side letter. We just talked about the --

> MR. FLEISCHER: I --

THE COURT: -- side letter.

MR. FLEISCHER: I certainly will.

THE COURT: Yeah.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

18

22

23

24

I certainly will. We do them all the MR. FLEISCHER: 12 time. I'm very confident we'll be able to reach agreement on a letter. We had discussed this particular issue and we resolved many of our other issues through the order that you'll see in a 15 redline on here on bid procedures and DIP. So this was just that last piece we wanted to get through. So we'll look to revisit this perhaps at another time.

THE COURT: All right. I appreciate it and, you 19 know, I just like I say, I can't -- I don't feel it appropriate to substitute my judgment for the experts and I'm going to let -- I'm going to leave it to their good judgment as to how that issue gets resolved and that --

MR. FLEISCHER: Understood, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- and hopefully you can come to an 25 accommodation.

MR. FLEISCHER: Thank you very much. 1 2 Thank you, Mr. Fleischer. THE COURT: MR. HUNTER: Your Honor, with that we did submit --3 4 you know, I handed up a redline. I do believe it's resolved 5 with all parties other than those issues we just talked about. So I'm happy to flip through the specific changes if you'd 7 like; otherwise, you know, I do think it's resolved and we 8 would ask that you enter the order. 9 THE COURT: Just one -- I had a question about the 10 additional goods. Is there some kind of guideline on that or is it just 11 12 that whatever additional goods there are can be brought in? 13 MR. HUNTER: Yeah. It's like "goods of similar quality," I believe is the wording. It's something along those 15 lines. THE COURT: There's a lot of goods --16 17 MR. HUNTER: Yeah. 18 THE COURT: -- with similar qualities --19 MR. HUNTER: Yeah. 20 THE COURT: -- right? I mean it could -- that's a broad universe. 22 MR. HUNTER: It's a benefit of a Bed Bath & Beyond, 23 Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Yeah. 25 MR. HUNTER: So it can't be wholly unrelated.

1 can't degradate the sale process or the business. It's meant $2 \parallel$ to go along with similar products that are already sold and we -- I think we have consistent language with other going out 4 of business sales as it relates to that.

THE COURT: So the answer is there is no limit, it's just that constraint?

MR. HUNTER: You mean a quantity limit?

THE COURT: Yeah.

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

17

21

22

2.4

25

MR. HUNTER: Oh, no. I don't think there is. can put as many of those as the liquidator and the company think makes sense and facilitates the sale.

THE COURT: And the debtor gets 7.5 percent of that?

MR. HUNTER: Exactly, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. I don't -- it's 4:30 15 and I don't want to keep all these people here if we don't have to. I just -- I didn't go through the specific changes. I don't -- I will go through them. I have it right here and I'm 18 sure they're fine, as everyone has agreed to them except for 19 the points that were raised about the -- I quess, well, actually about the latent defects. I mean but that would go in this order, right?

MR. HUNTER: Yes. There's language already in the 23 order. I think the point was Ms. Cordry thought it was insufficient.

> THE COURT: Yeah.

```
MR. HUNTER: So we're happy to look at her language
 1
 2 \parallel quickly. Maybe what it makes sense to do is we'll end up
   probably making a few tweaks. We'll submit it to Your Honor's
   chambers after the hearing once we have agreed on that.
                          Okay.
 5
             THE COURT:
 6
             MS. STEELE: Yes.
 7
             THE COURT:
                         Yes?
 8
             MS. STEELE: Your Honor, I'm getting ready to send in
 9
   the language right now. So --
10
             THE COURT:
                          Okay.
11
             MS. STEELE: -- they will see that on the latent
12
   defects.
13
                          Sending you language.
             THE COURT:
14
             MR. HUNTER: Okay.
15
             THE COURT:
                          All righty.
             MR. HUNTER: Great.
16
17
             THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
18
             MR. HUNTER: So we --
19
             MS. STEELE: Thank you.
20
             MR. HUNTER: -- we would just ask that if we could --
   you know, when we're in agreement with Ms. Cordry and submit an
22
   order --
23
             THE COURT: Just submit it --
24
             MR. HUNTER: -- at the end of the day.
25
             THE COURT:
                        -- and tell me that's what happened.
```

1 if not, you'll tell me what the disagreement is and I'll just decide it right there.

MR. HUNTER: Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

14

23

2.4

THE COURT: Okay?

MR. HUNTER: Thank you, Your Honor. With that, my part is done here. I'll turn it over to my colleague, Mr. Fiedler.

> THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FIEDLER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. For the 10 record, Ross Fiedler of Kirkland & Ellis on behalf the debtors.

In the same spirit as Mr. Hunter, I'll try to be 12 quick.

> THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FIEDLER: The next item on the agenda is the lien 15 holder motion. This was filed at Docket Number 22. By this 16 motion, we're seeking authorization to make payments to folks 17 who have a prepetition claim for goods or services delivered in 18 which such claimants may assert potential liens against the 19 debtors. These folks consist mainly of freight vendors and 20 third party warehousemen. And as was made clear in the presentation, it's imperative that the company be able to efficiently and expeditiously route merchandise from its distribution centers to the stores.

I understand there are no comments from the U.S. 25 Trustee. So unless Your Honor has any comments, we'd

1 respectfully request entry of the order.

2

6

7

8

9

10

16

17

18

22

23

THE COURT: Right. So the one thing that was unusual about this, to me, was that it was to pay prepetition secured claims and it wasn't to pay any other, you know, critical 5 vendors and I don't see that motion here at all.

MS. STEELE: That's a good thing, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah. No. I mean it's different. It's different. It's just different and --

MR. FIEDLER: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- so I understand it's just different 11 \parallel and that was what -- that's what popped out to me. I -- as was demonstrated by counsel for the lender, you know, the -- all these things were gone over with a fine tooth comb. You can see it. You can see it in the words and what is being said here today. So I really -- I don't have any issues with that and I will enter the order.

MR. FIEDLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Next is agenda item 7. This is the surety -- surety 19 and insurance bond motion. This is standard motion. We're seeking interim relief to continue the debtors' ordinary course insurance and surety bond program. We have approximately 50 insurance policies, 10 surety bonds outstanding.

We understand we're largely consensual on the motion. 24 We haven't received any further comments from the U.S. Trustee. 25 So if Your Honor has any questions, I'd be happy to answer

1 them.

2

4

5

7

8

11

13

15

17

19

22

25

THE COURT: No. We want you to have insurance. 3 in favor of that, as is the U.S. Trustee.

MS. STEELE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. So that'll be approved, as 6 well.

MR. FIEDLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Next is agenda item 8 filed at Docket Number 12. This is the taxes motion. Again, very standard. We're seeking $10\parallel$ authorization to pay sales and use taxes, as well as certain regulatory assessments and other permitting fees, so obviously 12 these are critical to continue operating the business.

If Your Honor has any questions, I'd be happy to answer those but we are resolved on the issues.

THE COURT: Well, I -- again, I'm not sure I saw exactly where the funding for all these payments came from, but I guess you make them if you can and I know you have to pay the 18 taxes as well, so I'll approve that also.

MR. FIEDLER: Okay. Great, Your Honor. for me. So now I'll turn it over to my colleague, Mr. Sterrett.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

23 MR. STERRETT: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Charlie 2.4 Sterrett of Kirkland & Ellis on behalf of the debtors.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. STERRETT: I'm going to try to set the record for 2 the quickest pace here on the Kirkland side.

THE COURT: No problem.

1

3

4

6

7

11

13

18

22

23

MR. STERRETT: I'll be taking us to the balance of 5 the agenda this afternoon.

THE COURT: Okay. Great.

MR. STERRETT: We'll start with the utilities motion filed at Docket Number 21. This seeks customary utilities relief and affixes an adequate assurance amount for the debtors 10∥at half of a month's utilities expense based on the run rate prepetition, less any amounts currently on deposit with the 12 utilities. Those are offset.

We're fully resolved with all parties on this order, including the U.S. Trustee. We took one comment in the version 15 order we'll be submitting to the Court later this afternoon from a landlord and it's, you know, purely reservation-of-17 rights type language.

And so, you know, with that, I'd like to ask the 19 Court, if you'd prefer, we submit all of our orders once more at the end of this hearing this evening for you to review and sign or, you know, should we go only with those that have changed?

THE COURT: That's a good point because it does get 24 confusing for Mr. Fiedler. Yes, there is on -- when, you know, 25 \parallel some of them are final and some of them aren't. But that's

1 probably your -- that's probably a very good idea. So why $2 \parallel don't you -- the only thing that means is that, you know, it's$ 4:30 now and I'm not sure.

Is it critical that they be entered or is tomorrow 5 morning also -- I actually have motions tomorrow morning, but 6 you'll let me know.

MR. HUNTER: Well, Your Honor, I think there --

MR. STERRETT: It's --

4

7

8

9

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

MR. HUNTER: -- are a few that it's critical that we get entered today so that the payroll can get processed. would be cash management, wages, the DIP, and joint 12 administration. The rest, no problem.

THE COURT: Cash management, wages, DIP and joint administration. Well, of those, we did -- we didn't do joint administration and the wages we did. So just -- well, those 16 four, right --

MR. HUNTER: Yes.

THE COURT: -- will be done.

MR. HUNTER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Fielder?

MR. FIEDLER: No problem.

THE COURT: All right. But still with that same process and if we could get a few more entered, we'll do that, as well.

MR. HUNTER: Okay.

MR. STERRETT: Thank you, Your Honor. We endeavor to 2 make everyone's lives a little easier if we can.

> THE COURT: Okay.

1

3

4

5

7

8

11

12

17

19

22

23

MR. STERRETT: And, you know, absent any objections from the courtroom, we request your entry of the utilities 6 order.

THE COURT: Yeah. No. I saw what -- you know, the application seemed very reasonable and, you know, the deposits are there and it's an interim order, like a lot of these are, 10 so I'm happy to enter the order.

MR. STERRETT: Thank you, Your Honor.

The next is the NOL motion filed at Docket Number 23. 13 Through this order, the debtors are seeking approval of procedures for certain transfers of common and preferred stock. The debtors have considerable tax attributes that are valuable and in a case where value is cut so thin and we're, you know, focused on efficiency and preserving value of the estates, this $18 \parallel$ is an incredibly important motion at this juncture.

And all we're seeking to do is provide control to the estates and the debtors in terms of understanding what transfers are being made and giving an opportunity to object to any that would threaten the tax attributes.

We're fully resolved with all parties and interests 24 that have raised concerns and the U.S. Trustee's language is incorporated into the order that's with the Court. So absent

any questions, we'd request your entry of the NOL order.

1

2

7

8

11

12

17

19

21

22

23

THE COURT: All right. I -- on this one, I just --3 this one actually bleeds over into another one about the 4 waiving the requirement of the list of equity security holders, 5 which it sounds like you're handling. And I understand the 6 part about the common shareholders and all that.

But like if, for example, in this one, if a substantial shareholder is an entity that has beneficial ownership of 4.5 percent and I was wondering -- and then in order to send them this notice, you have to know that there's someone who has 4.5 percent, right?

MR. STERRETT: That's right, Your Honor. Well, 13 however I'll state that we are noticing this to all, you know, known registered equity holders, common and preferred, to the extent, you know, we have the information necessary to do so. Our claim -- proposed claims and noticing agent, Kroll, is working with AST, American Stock Transfer, to get as much $18 \parallel$ noticing information for common equity holders as possible.

So, you know, we are trying to notice as much as we can and, you know, this contemplates 4.5 percent holders of common and preferred, but it also, you know, is anybody who's interested in owning 4.5 percent of common. So that --

THE COURT: Right. But like I said, I was kind of focused on the other one, on the one where you were waiving the list of equity holders and I understand it, again, as to the common stock.

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm just wondering why you wouldn't want to, if you 3 know it and it seems like you know it, you wouldn't want to $4 \parallel$ just specifically -- why you wouldn't be able to specifically 5 list those equity holders at more than 4.5 percent and -- yeah. I don't -- I'm just not sure why you would -- why it -- is that a problem or is it to list those people that have --

MR. STERRETT: We're happy to do so. We're happy to list --

THE COURT: -- well --

MR. STERRETT: -- equity holders with --

THE COURT: -- if so. I mean people -- I think 13 people, if there's one thing that lawyer -- sometimes lawyers and other people look at is, like, who owns this and I think you -- I don't think it's that hard to do. So and I don't want to put an undue burden on. I just want to -- especially people that are subject to this, why not notice them and put them on 18 the list.

MR. STERRETT: We're happy to.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. STERRETT: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Great. Thank you.

MR. STERRETT: All right. So absent any further questions, we'd respectfully request your entry of the NOL order.

THE COURT: Yeah. And I think we might have just covered two with one.

MR. STERRETT: I'll take it. Yeah.

THE COURT: All right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

17

18

22

24

MR. STERRETT: Great. Absolutely. We'll move on then to the joint administration order entered or at -- filed at Docket Number 5.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. STERRETT: We have 75 affiliated entities and we're seeking routine relief to administer these complex cases under the publicly traded name of the -- the name of the 12 publicly traded parent company, Bed Bath & Beyond, Inc.

MS. STEELE: Yes, Your Honor. And the U.S. Trustee has no objection and the debtor did place language in the order that we requested that the monthly operating reports, under the new guidelines, are filed in each case and that was agreed to and put into the order.

THE COURT: Okay. Yeah. Well, I mean the --19 certainly, this is a good base to be jointly administered and you addressed that concern, so it would be not a good case to not have jointly administered, so that's a pretty easy one.

MR. STERRETT: We agree wholeheartedly. Thank you, 23 Your Honor.

We'll move onto the case management motion, which is 25 filed at Docket Number 7. We're aware of the 2009 general

1 order in place in the District of New Jersey. However, you $2 \parallel \text{know}$, a lot of time has passed in, you know, since 2009 and our -- we seek with our case management procedures to, you 4 know, move things into the, you know, 2020s here.

THE COURT: Right. Yeah. I -- that's a little bit of a shot, but I'll take it.

MR. STERRETT: Made respect of -- respectfully, of course.

THE COURT: All right. It's okay. I got it.

MR. STERRETT: And so these are --

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

17

18

22

23

25

THE COURT: I'm going to have to talk to the chief 12 \parallel judge about that one.

MR. STERRETT: And these are routine procedures and are seeking to, you know, ease the administrative burden on the 15 Court and the parties in terms of, you know, setting the table 16 for the administration of these cases. And so happy to discuss and, you know, we've been thinking about scheduling and we're happy to do so now or at the end. But -- or separately through, you know, discussing with chambers, but that's what would be accomplished as part of this motion. So absent any questions, we'd request your entry of the case management order.

THE COURT: You went -- the U.S. Trustee's okay with 24 this one?

MS. STEELE: Yes, Your Honor. No objection.

THE COURT: Yeah. I think it's a good thing to have 2 those case management procedures and guidelines updated, as well, and to -- makes sense to me, so we'll approve that order, as well.

1

5

6

7

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. STERRETT: Great. Thank you, Your Honor.

Next up is the claims agent 156(c), retention application for Kroll filed at Docket Number 6. Here we have got Kroll, who's, you know, amply capable of handling the responsibilities of claims and noticing agent in these cases. 10 | They will serve as noticing agent on the case website and assist with the, you know, copious noticing required in this 12 case, thousands of stakeholders, and we think they're up for the case. So absent any questions, we'd request your entry of order.

THE COURT: No. They're certainly well-known and 16 well regarded and I have no problem with them serving as the agent that way.

MR. STERRETT: Thank you.

THE COURT: So we'll approve that, as well.

MR. STERRETT: Great.

MS. STEELE: No objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I'm sorry. Thank you. Thank I rule quickly.

MR. STERRETT: We're moving at a break-neck pace. 25 \parallel next up is the creditor matrix motion filed at Docket Number 8, 1 which you mentioned earlier. We might have, you know, killed $2 \parallel$ two birds with one stone. I just want to flag that, you know, 3 here -- with herein, we are working with redaction of 4 personally identifiable information and that includes home and 5 email addresses of individual creditors and all personally 6 identifiable information of minors. I understand we're resolved with the U.S. Trustee on that point and all other objections and requested information's incorporated in this order. So absent any questions, we'd request your entry.

THE COURT: Anyone have any comments?

MS. STEELE: No objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, I think this is a very standard and appropriate order, as well, and that you addressed personally identifiable information issues. So that will be entered, as 15 well.

MR. STERRETT: Thank you, Your Honor. Two more to 17 go.

THE COURT: All right.

10

11

12

16

18

19

MR. STERRETT: We have the SOFA and schedule 20 extension, timeline extension, motion filed at Docket Number 9. Herein, we're requesting a 20-day extension of the timeline by which we must replay our schedules and statements. trying strike a balance between the shortened timeline for 24 these cases and the massive amounts of leases, contracts and 25 \parallel other books and records of the company.

THE COURT: So I have no problem with that obviously, $2 \parallel$ but I -- and I think this almost goes without saying, and I 3 know it'll happen, is that, of course, when the Committee gets $4 \parallel$ appointed, you'll be -- exchange with them the information that 5 they reasonably request so that they can get up to speed on all kinds of different issues, including the liens and all other -and that.

You know, because normally they need the schedules to do at least part of that investigation. So, like I say, I have 10 \parallel no problem with the 20 days, but I do think I'm informally or, you know, unofficially saying that also assumes that you're going to be cooperating with them and providing them, answering 13 their reasonable requests.

MR. STERRETT: Of course.

1

7

8

11

14

15

17

23

25

MS. STEELE: Yes, Your Honor. And just with respect 16 to the U.S. Trustee, we have spoken to counsel and that puts the date that the schedules would be filed on or around 18 May 30th and we have sent -- set a tentative date for the 341 19 for June 5th. So we're hopeful that there won't be any extensions for requests for the schedules and Statement of Affairs so we can receive them on or about the 30th in order to prepare for the 341 meeting.

THE COURT: Yeah. You know we actually had a different date. I think it fell on a Saturday, but maybe that's --

```
MS. STEELE: Okay.
 1
 2
             THE COURT: -- why you're saying the --
 3
             MS. STEELE: Oh, that's -- because Monday is Memorial
   Day.
         So I moved it --
 5
                        Memorial -- yeah. That's -- so that's
             THE COURT:
 6
   why you're saying it.
 7
             MS. STEELE: I moved it to Tuesday.
 8
             THE COURT: Yeah. Yeah. So --
 9
             MR. STERRETT: We'll take the free days at the end of
10
   our --
11
             THE COURT: Oh, yeah. Yeah.
12
             MR. STERRETT: Yeah. Right.
13
             THE COURT: You have got to --
             MR. STERRETT: Absolutely.
14
15
             THE COURT: You know add an extra day bonus you got.
16
             MR. STERRETT: Yeah. So absent any further questions
17
   or comments, we'd respect --
18
             THE COURT: Well --
19
             MR. STERRETT: -- respectfully request --
20
             THE COURT: -- I --
21
             MR. STERRETT: -- your entry of that order.
22
             THE COURT: That's good. That'll be approved, as
23 well.
24
             MR. STERRETT: Great.
                                    Thank you, Your Honor.
25
             And that takes us to the last item on the debtors'
```

1 agenda today and that's a largely administrative and, you know, 2 procedural order on cross-border protocols. That's filed at 3 Docket Number 24.

By these protocols, we seek to just put in place kind 5 of the guidelines and framework for the interplay between -- if 6 necessary, any interplay between the debtors can -- non-debtor affiliates Canadian proceeding in Canada. That's anticipated 8 to wrap up in short order, but to the extent there's any overlap and interplay between the U.S. proceeding and the $10 \parallel$ Canadian proceeding, we want to put these in place in the interest of comity, you know, cross-border judicial 12 administration efficiency.

THE COURT: Well, I do have one question on that one 14 is that --

> MR. STERRETT: Okay.

4

11

13

15

18

22

23

THE COURT: -- was that presented to the Canadian 16 17 court?

MR. STERRETT: It hasn't been presented to the 19 Canadian court and based on the timeline of the CCWA, it may not need to be. But we want to make sure that our piece of the puzzle is in place in case anything comes up where they need to present this to the court.

THE COURT: But in the interest of comity, so to be 24 consistent, wouldn't it make sense that both of us are okay 25 with it before it gets entered in one? Unless that's a

I just I want to do what the order says is what I'm 1 problem. 2 saying.

MR. STERRETT: That's --

3

4

8

9

11

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: The order is saying that we should be in 5 comity with each other, right? I mean being in comity with 6 each other, to me, means that you are on the same page on things and I don't have any problem with anything I read in there.

But, you know, I just I -- as much as I'm saying it 10 for notice purposes, I'm saying it out of respect and comity purposes, so if you could just tell me. Is your Canadian 12 counsel going to --

MR. STERRETT: Okay. Let us confer with Canadian counsel on this. I think we can, you know -- I don't think there's anything urgent and pressing cross-border between --

THE COURT: Yeah. This doesn't --

MR. STERRETT: -- the U.S. proceeding --

THE COURT: -- seem urgent.

MR. STERRETT: -- I think we're --

THE COURT: Out of all the things in this case --

MR. STERRETT: Right.

THE COURT: -- this one does not seem urgent.

MR. STERRETT: Right. I think --

THE COURT: So I --

MR. STERRETT: Yeah. We don't foresee any issues on

```
1 \parallel a cross-border basis between the Canadian and U.S. proceedings
 2 \parallel here. This was purely, you know, administrative and, you know,
 3 relatively standard in retail, cross-border retails. However,
 4 we understand your concern and we can come back to this after
 5
   we have conferred --
 6
             THE COURT: All right.
             MR. STERRETT: -- with Canadian --
 7
             THE COURT: So we'll hold off --
 8
 9
             MR. STERRETT: -- counsel.
10
             THE COURT: -- on that one until you give us the
11
   heads up that it's okay. And that -- and I don't know if
12 you're handling this part or --
13
             MR. STERRETT: I feel like someone's right behind me.
14
             THE COURT: Yeah. Yeah, he is. Yeah, because we
15 need to set dates or a date --
16
             MS. GEIER: When am I not hovering over your --
17
             MR. STERRETT: It's okay.
18
             THE COURT: -- we need to --
19
             MR. STERRETT: -- I'll cede the podium to --
20
             THE COURT: -- we need to set dates --
21
             MR. STERRETT: -- Ms. Geier.
22
             THE COURT: -- for the final hearings. Is that why
23
   you're getting up?
24
                         Yes, Your Honor. Emily Geier again on
             MS. GEIER:
25 behalf of the debtors just here to talk about dates. I believe
```

1 Your Honor wanted to get on the record, we have -- I think we 2 have discussed and agreed on May 16th assuming other parties don't have an issue with that and that works for Your Honor's schedule or at least that was what had been --

> THE COURT: Well, here --

5

6

7

12

13

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

MS. GEIER: -- discussed to some extent.

THE COURT: -- is the thing, right? Here's the thing, right, that I actually have somewhat of a heavy motion calendar tomorrow and because I was provided with a lot of $10 \parallel$ reading materials, I had to put off a couple of the more 11 substantive things to May 16th.

> MS. GEIER: I see, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And that I already did that and I -- in fact, I think one of the attorneys that got up here, Mr. Fleischer, is the attorney on one of the cases, just a completely different case. But --

Do you think Mr. Fleischer would like to MS. GEIER: 18 continue that one and make this easier on us?

THE COURT: I know that --

I'm sure we can find another date. MS. GEIER:

THE COURT: Yeah. So --

MS. GEIER: That's no problem.

THE COURT: So anyway, so that, I know, is already a heavy motion day that morning and so then it would be in the afternoon, I think. Is that -- or I don't know if there's

travel schedules or issues or --

MR. HUNTER: That's fine.

The afternoon is fine for the debtors, MS. GEIER: Your Honor. If that's an issue for anyone else, otherwise --MS. STEELE: The afternoon is fine for the U.S.

6 Trustee, Your Honor.

1

2

3

5

7

8

11

13

17

18

22

23

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Or I could give you another date if, you know, the -- and the other -- I have a lot of scheduling things that I need to discuss. Another one is that I have -- you see there's all these books behind me and I have had an ongoing trial that is basically Wednesdays, then 12 Fridays, because that's the days that I have.

And they just told me the last day that it's likely go into June or July. So I have hearings every Tuesday and Thursday and I have trials -- not every Wednesday and Friday, because people have scheduling conflicts, but a lot of Wednesdays and Fridays.

So on the omnibus dates, it felt like maybe we 19 would -- well, I have two -- there's two minds on that because I think the 16th could be a very important and busy one and it could be a number of things on that day, but then as the case progresses, they get less heavy.

So, you know, we could -- like I say, if there's a 24 week that I have some flexibility, it's probably -- when do --25 that's the week we don't have a trial, only one day, right?

MR. STERRETT: Well, we do on the --1 2 THE COURT: The --3 MR. STERRETT: -- 17th. 4 THE COURT: -- May 14th week -- May 15th week one? 5 MR. STERRETT: Right. And we do have on the 17th. 6 THE COURT: We do have it on the 17th. 7 MR. STERRETT: Yeah. THE COURT: Yeah. So anyway, I -- if you want to do 8 it on the afternoon of the 16th, we'll do it on the afternoon of the 16th. MS. GEIER: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. 11 12 MS. STEELE: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 MS. GEIER: Are there --THE COURT: 14 Then --15 MS. GEIER: -- other dates that you wanted to discuss 16 or --17 THE COURT: Yeah. So another thing is that I 18 actually have a longstanding family vacation planned. actually not much of a -- it's not really a vacation. do something with my wife's family and I'm leaving Sunday and I won't be back until the following Sunday. 22 So it seems like things are under control and it 23 won't be an issue, but if there is an issue, I'm going to be 24 out of pocket. And if there is an issue, you know, you just

25 \parallel contact Mr. Fugetis and he'll -- or my -- or one of my clerks

1 and let them know that you need a hearing or you need -- and I 2 have already spoke to one or two of my colleagues and I'll --3 you know, it depends on the day, but people, you know -someone else will be available if some kind of emergent issue comes up.

MS. GEIER: Thank you so much, Your Honor. We will strive to make every, every effort that no issue comes up during that time and I'm sure we can resolve anything pending your return. But --

THE COURT: Well, I'm okay if you go to somebody else resolves it.

12 (Laughter.)

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. GEIER: We wouldn't dream of it.

We believe that the objection deadline is set by 15 Local Rules seven days in advance from the 16th, but please let me know if that is incorrect and we'll make sure to plug in the correct date for the objection deadline for the hearing.

> THE COURT: Yeah.

MS. GEIER: Seven days, correct?

THE COURT: Yeah.

MS. GEIER: Yes?

THE COURT: That's right.

MS. GEIER: Okay.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MS. STEELE: And, Your Honor --

MS. GEIER: Perfect.

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

21

22

MS. STEELE: -- just with respect to the objection date. You know, we're going to try to form the Committee as fast as possible, but I'm sure if the Committee would need a day or so, I'm sure they could reach out to counsel. everyone nodding their heads, so I just wanted to put that --

> THE COURT: Yeah.

MS. STEELE: -- on the record.

MS. GEIER: Of course.

Yeah. And if there's --THE COURT:

MS. STEELE: Thank you.

THE COURT: -- a scheduling issue, you come to me and 13 I'll resolve it and --

MS. STEELE: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- and I'll try to be reasonable. That's 16 what I try to do.

> MR. HUNTER: Thank you.

MS. GEIER: Amazing. Thank you so much, Your Honor, 19 for hearing us on such short notice and reading all of the thousands of pages that we sent you. So thank you very much for your time.

THE COURT: No, no. We're glad to be of assistance 23 and I -- you know, many cases -- you always want the cases to turn out well, but as we started out today with the initial 25 presentation, this is a different case and a special case and

1 especially want it to succeed and we -- and I'm very, very $2 \parallel$ convinced that the right team is there to -- and I'm not just 3 speaking about the debtors' side. 4 I'm speaking about all the parties that the --5 because I have seen it. It's evident in the papers. And all the parties working together, that's what this process is really ultimately all about, as you all know, and I wish you 7 much luck and I know that there's going to be a hard -- a lot of hard work and hopefully success, okay? 10 MS. GEIER: Thank you, Judge. 11 ATTORNEYS: Thank you, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Thank you. 13 ATTORNEYS: Thank you. THE COURT: 14 Thank you. 15 MS. GEIER: Your Honor --16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Judge, just want to set the 17 time. Two -- oh, yeah, 2:00. 18 THE COURT: 19 MS. STEELE: 2:00. 20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 2:30 or we might have --21 THE COURT: 2:00 -- I think that could be a little 22 bit of a heavy day. It's possible to be a heavy day. 23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So 2:30 then? 24 THE COURT: 2:00.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 2:00.

25

MS. STEELE: 2:00. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. MS. STEELE: Thank you, Your Honor. ATTORNEYS: Thank you, Your Honor. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Judge. MS. GEIER: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. Have a good afternoon.

3 certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the 4 official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the

5 above-entitled matter, and to the best of my ability.

/s/ Ruth Ann Hager

8 RUTH ANN HAGER

9 J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. DATE: May 1, 2023

CERTIFICATION

I, RUTH ANN HAGER, court-approved transcriber,